

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 915

CG 008 103

AUTHOR Teahan, John E.
TITLE A Study of the Values and Attitudes of Black and White Police Officers.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.; New Detroit, Inc., Mich..
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 245p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$9.87
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; Educational Programs; Interpersonal Relationship; Negro Attitudes; Personal Values; *Police; *Police Community Relationship; *Race Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Role Playing

ABSTRACT

Better understanding, openness, and trust among black and white police officers would increase police effectiveness in dealing with police-community relations. This study discusses a program to improve black-white police relations through role playing techniques and small group interactions on problems of human relationships. Longitudinal in design, the study assesses: (1) changes in values and attitudes over time; (2) optimal implementation time for the training program; (3) effectiveness of the program; and (4) the attitudinal effect on officers of precinct assignments and inter-racial contact. Some positive changes took place in the attitudes of black officers participating in the program during academy training. Negative attitude changes occurred in white participants and spread to white non-participants. A similar program conducted a year later avoided the severe backlash effect by downplaying its racially-motivated aspects. It, too, failed to improve black-white relations in any significant way. It appears that polarization between black and white officers begins upon entrance to the police academy, although a training program can sensitize each group to the other. Precinct assignment has little impact on values but strong impact on attitudes development, with duty in white precincts fostering undesirable viewpoints about blacks among both black and white officers. The study suggests that rotating precinct assignments for all officers would be a helpful step in combating stereotypic racial attitudes among all police. (Author/NMF)

A STUDY OF THE VALUES AND ATTITUDES OF BLACK AND
WHITE POLICE OFFICERS

- A. The Use of Role Playing and Group Experience to Modify Attitudes
- B. Changes in Values and Attitudes and Values Over Time
- C. The Effect of Precinct Assignment and Inter-Racial Contact on Attitude Formation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

John E. Teahan

Department of Psychology

Wayne State University

December, 1972

00 008 103

This research was supported in part by funds administered under the Michigan Educational Act, Title I, Project No. 146 (70-014-009) and by a grant from New Detroit, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
 CHAPTER I	
Phase 1: The Impact of the Training Program During Police Academy Training	5
Procedure:	
Selection of Subjects	5
The Group Experience	6
Instruments to Evaluate the Impact of the Program	8
Testing Procedure	10
Results:	
Effects of Group Experience: White Officers	11
Experimental Whites Versus C-Controls	22
Effects of Group Experience: Black Officers	47
Summary of Changes Following Group Sessions	59
Discussion of Results	60
 CHAPTER II	
Phase 2: Group Experience	69
Procedure:	
Structuring of the Groups	71
Post-Testing	72
Subjects	73
Group Leaders	74
Analysis of Data	74
Results:	
Overall Treatment Effect for Whites	75
Overall Treatment Effect for Blacks	94
Discussion	115
 CHAPTER III	
Initial Differences Between Black and White Officers and Changes in Attitudes Over Time	125
Results:	
Initial Attitudes of White and Black Officers	128
Attitude Changes Over Time for Black and White Officers	137
Summary of Changes	153
Discussion of Racial Differences and Attitude Shifts	155
Summary	167

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

	Page
CHAPTER IV	
The Effect of Precinct Assignment on Attitudes and Values . . .	169
Results:	
Precinct Analysis	169
Inter-Racial Contact and Attitudes	193
The Ratio of Black to White Officers in Precincts	195
Discussion	200
BIBLIOGRAPHY	210
APPENDICES	213

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Terminal Values of White Experimentals and E-Controls	12
II	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Instrumental Values of White Experimentals and E-Controls	15
III	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for California F and E Scales and Other Questionnaire Items of White Experimentals and E-Controls	18
IV	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Terminal Values of White Experimentals and C-Controls	23
V	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Instrumental Values of White Experimentals and C-Controls	26
VI	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for California F and E Scales and Other Questionnaire Items of White Experimentals and E - Controls	29
VII	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Terminal Values of White E-Controls and C-Controls	36
VIII	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Instrumental Values of White E-Controls and C-Controls	39
IX	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for California F and E Scales and Other Questionnaire Items of White E-Controls and C-Controls	42
X	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Terminal Values of Black Experimentals and Controls	48
XI	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Instrumental Values of Black Experimentals and Controls	51
XII	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for California F and E Scales and Other Questionnaire Items of Black Experimentals and Controls	55
XIII	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for White Officers on Terminal Values	77

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

TABLE		Page
XIV	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for White Officers on Instrumental Values	79
XV	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for White Officers on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	82
XVI	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for White Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on Terminal Values	85
XVII	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for White Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on Instrumental Values	87
XVIII	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for White Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	89
XIX	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for Black Officers on Terminal Values	95
XX	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for Black Officers on Instrumental Values	97
XXI	Analysis of Variance of Overall Treatment Effects for Black Officers on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	99
XXII	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for Black Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on Terminal Values	105
XXIII	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for Black Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on Instrumental Values	108
XXIV	Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects for Black Officers by White and Black Group Leaders on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	111
XXV	Terminal Value Means, Composite Rank Order and T Ratios for Black and White Police Officers	129
XXVI	Instrumental Value Means, Composite Rank Order and T Ratios for Black and White Police Officers	131
XXVII	Comparison of Black and White Police Officers on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	133
XXVIII	Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Terminal Values upon Entering Police Academy, at Graduation and Eighteen Months Later	138

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

TABLE	Page
XXIX Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for Instrumental Values Upon Entering Police Academy, at Graduation and Eighteen Months Later	142
XXX Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance for California F and E scales and Other Questionnaire Items Upon Entering Police Academy, at Graduation and Eighteen Months Later	146
XXXI Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for White Officers on Terminal Values	170
XXXII Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for White Officers on Instrumental Values	175
XXXIII Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for White Officers on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	178
XXXIV Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for Black Officers on Terminal Values	182
XXXV Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for Black Officers on Instrumental Values	185
XXXVI Analysis of Variance of White, Mixed and Black Precincts for Black Officers on the California F and E Scales and on Other Questionnaire Items	188
XXXVII Significant Correlations between Percentage of Black Officers at Each Precinct and Dependent Measures of Black and White Officers	194
XXXVIII Significant Correlations between Percentage of Black Officers at Each Precinct and Dependent Measures of Black and White Officers	197
XXXIX A Comparison of Former White C-Controls with Eighteen Months Experience with Veteran White Officers on Terminal Values	224
XL A Comparison of Former White C-Controls with Eighteen Months Experience with Veteran White Officers on Instrumental Values	225
XLI A Comparison of Former White C-Controls with Eighteen Months Experience with Veteran White Officers on Other Attitude Measures	226
XLII Analysis of Phase 2 Experimentals Considering Phase I Status on Terminal Values	228

LIST OF TABLES CONTINUED

TABLE		Page
XLIII	Analysis of Phase 2 Experimentals Considering Phase I Status on Instrumental Values	231
XLIV	Analysis of Phase 2 Experimentals Considering Phase I Status on Other Attitude Measures	234

INTRODUCTION

Of great concern today in police-community relations is the absence of dialogue between police and the black community and the degree of suspicion and hostility which is often present on both sides. However, of even greater importance is the absence of openness and dialogue between blacks and whites within the police community itself, since one cannot expect trust and good feelings in inter-group relationships if these conditions do not exist on an intra-group level.

This issue was brought to the writer's attention during a project within the police department of a large midwestern city. While interviewing black and white officers with the rank of sergeant and above, it became clear that two levels of reality existed within the department-- a black reality and a white reality. Although the blacks were aware of these "two realities," the white officers seemed aware of only their own. That is, black officers knew that their perception of the department and its important problems and issues differed in many ways from their white counterparts'. White officers, on the other hand, assumed that they agreed, on most issues, with their black fellow officers. Further evidence of the disparity between the black and white structures within police departments has also been documented by Mendelsohn (1969) with respect to the causes of racial unrest within communities.

The present study was involved in pursuing a number of issues. First was the problem of the disparity between black and white officers

in their values, in their perceptions of the department, especially with respect to racial issues, and in their attitudes towards each other and the community. A few studies have been done in this area (Alex, 1959; Kephart, 1957) but none have dealt with it in a systematic fashion.

There have also been many suggestions in the literature that the value orientations of police, particularly white police, are primarily the result of their working-class background and that their work experience has had little impact in further shaping these attitudes (Kephart, 1957; Lipset, 1969; Rokeach, 1971). Unfortunately, none of these studies have been longitudinal in nature so that changes in men could be plotted from the time they joined the force until they had been in police work for a year or more. Certainly most officers with whom this investigator has spoken are of the opinion that the first year of police work has a great deal of influence on attitudes, but up until now no real evidence, beyond hearsay, has been offered to support this contention. Of special interest, in this regard, is whether there is a differential effect on black and white officers. Do they become increasingly more polarized over time or does the common goal of law enforcement bring them closer together in terms of their perception of police-community problems?

If large changes do take place in officers, what periods are most crucial in this shaping? McNamara (1967) suggests that it is during the police academy that some attitudes change, especially those concerning authority. Again, however, many officers would insist that it is regular police duty that has the greatest impact on a man and that this is especially dependent upon the precinct to which the officer is assigned, particularly in terms of whether it is in a high crime versus a low crime area. No studies have been conducted on this particular question to date.

The main purpose of the present study, however, was to develop a program which might lead to better understanding, openness and trust among black and white patrolmen in order to increase their effectiveness in dealing with community-police problems. The method by which it was hoped this goal might be accomplished was role playing techniques and small group interactions in which meaningful dialogue between black and white officers on problems associated with human relationships would take place. The use of role playing to facilitate the process of attitude change has lead from dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) which predicts that changes in cognitions take place when compliance to behaviors atypical for an individual are encouraged. Studies by Janis and King (1954), Janis and Mann (1965) and Culbertson (1957) have all shown the effectiveness of this technique in modifying attitudes on issues ranging from smoking behavior to housing integration. McNamara (1967), Bard (1970) and others have used it successfully in training police to deal more effectively with domestic and other interpersonal crises. Thus, in the present study it was felt that by taking the role of the other, insight on the part of both black and white police into the impact of necessary police action on citizens might help to decrease disharmony between both officers of different races and eventually between the department and the community.

One question that immediately arises concerns whether there is an optimal time for such training. Would it be better to begin immediately with recruits entering the academy and try to create an impact before other less constructive attitudes were formed? Or should such training begin after the patrolmen have begun regular police duty when the group experience could be tied in with ongoing problems faced in the street?

Would it be even better yet for men to receive such training both in the academy and following graduation? An attempt was therefore made to deal with these questions by setting up the program in such a way that comparisons could be made between men trained in the academy versus men trained in the field versus those trained in both settings. These patrolmen could then be compared with randomly selected officers who had received no such training in order to determine the impact of the program on selected values and attitudes.

The following chapters will deal with these various aspects of the study, beginning with the impact of the training program and then examining the attitudes and values of black and white officers as they enter the academy, just prior to graduation and finally after eighteen months of regular police duty. Comparisons will also be made between these men and veteran officers who have had three or more years of street duty. Finally, the effect of various precinct assignments on officers will be studied to determine whether certain kinds of high crime areas have a special impact on officers.

CHAPTER 1

PHASE 1: THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM DURING POLICE

ACADEMY TRAINING

Selection of Subjects

A total of 149 white and 31 black police cadets comprised the entire sample of men in the first phase of this study. This represented the final number of men who graduated from four separate police classes, each containing approximately 45 men, over a total period of five months. Three of these four classes were selected to be used as the pool from which experimental subjects, who would be seen in weekly group sessions, would be chosen. Thus from Class I, 20 men were randomly chosen to be experimentals, of these, 14 were white and 6 were black and they were divided into two experimental groups of 10 men each (with 7 whites and 3 blacks in each group). From this same class 20 more men were randomly selected (14 whites and 6 blacks) and they were designated as controls who would not receive the weekly small group experience.

From police Class II, 10 men were randomly selected (7 whites and 3 blacks) and these were again designated as an experimental group. Ten controls were then randomly selected, matching for race, and these men received no group training. In a similar fashion to Class I, 20 men were selected from police Class III (14 whites and 6 blacks), and again these were divided into two experimental groups containing 7 whites and 3 blacks. Twenty controls were also selected from this same class.

Thus, from three separate police classes a total sample of 50 experimentals was anticipated (35 whites and 15 blacks) with an equal number of controls, selected from the same classes. These latter, of course, would receive no group training sessions.

In addition to this a fourth police class was selected which was to serve as a special control. It was felt that there might be some general influence exerted on an entire class when group sessions were run with some members of that same class. For this reason police Class IV received only pre- and post-testing and was in no way involved in any aspect of the experimental group program. This class therefore served as a kind of control-control and will be referred to in this fashion later in the paper.

The following schematic diagram indicates the structure of the subject sample.

Police Class I Approx. 45 men		Police Class II Approx. 45 men		Police Class III Approx. 45 men		Police Class IV Approx. 45 men	
Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	No groups		
N = 10	N = 10	N = 10	N = 10	N = 10			
7W & 3B	7W & 3B	7W & 3B	7W & 3B	7W & 3B			

Because of the loss of two men during the academy period, at a point where it was too late to find a replacement, the final sample of men who were seen in weekly group sessions during the academy training period was 48 men (35 whites and 13 blacks).

The Group Experience

As mentioned all group members were randomly selected from their various police classes. Although the program was essentially voluntary, at the same time these new police recruits did not actually feel free to refuse a program which had been endorsed by the academy and the commissioner. For this reason the sample used was unbiased. On only a very

few occasions did a man refuse to participate and in each of these cases it was the opinion of the group leader who interviewed them that the man had a legitimate excuse.

The following format was used to introduce the program to the men.

INTERVIEW GUIDE

"A major problem facing the police and the community today is police-community relations and specifically black-white relations. This problem has been viewed as especially acute by the police department and it is because of this that the commissioner is promoting the present experimental program which is designed to help police officers develop skills which will increase their sensitivity to and skills in handling the complex problems which arise so often in police work.

"Although the program is voluntary, we hope that everyone who is asked to participate will do so, and the department will look with favor upon participants. We are hoping that a program of this nature will be of interest to you and we wish to enlist your participation. It will involve only 1½ hours per week over the next twelve weeks. You will be paid time-and-a-half for your participation, which would be one session per week from 5:00 to 6:30. You will meet in small groups of ten men and through the use of role-playing techniques and discussions, we will attempt to develop more effective methods of dealing with the kind of crucial and sensitive situations which arise in police work. We are also interested in developing better lines of communication between officers and we will encourage the men to work out group solutions to police problems as they arise through the use of roles and group interaction."

All experimentals met in groups of 10 (7 whites and 3 blacks) on a weekly basis for one and one half hour sessions over a twelve week period. Initially the group leader used role-playing techniques in order to stimulate group discussions. Role situations were set up to promote discussion of black-white relationships and they also involved some police problem where both the race of the officers and the suspects could be varied. Thus the group leader relied upon role-reversals so that whites could play the part of blacks and vice-versa. Role playing, however, was simply thought of as a vehicle to stimulate the expression of actual feelings of group members for one another, especially those with racial overtones.

Therefore the group leader was free to use or ignore the roles which had been set up to cover each of the twelve sessions.

A typical role playing situation was as follows: Two officers representing scout car partners were chosen (or volunteered) from the group. A third officer was then assigned the role of a citizen. The scout car men were then given a card with the following information:

"You are cruising in your scout car at 12 PM in the 13th precinct when you receive information over the car radio that an armed robbery has just been committed a few blocks away. The suspect is described as a young adult black male in his early twenties dressed in a dark overcoat. Suddenly you notice a young man fitting that description walking ahead of you. You pull up beside him and"

The officer designated as the citizen receives a similar card with the following information.

"You are a university student who has just finished seeing a movie a few blocks away. It is 12 PM and you are hurrying home to your apartment when a police squad car pulls up beside you" The officers then acted out the situation with the rest of the group observing. Following this discussion began, often with other group members volunteering to play the police role in a different manner from that observed. Initially the leader relied heavily on role situations of this nature but later, past the half way mark, he discovered that role playing was often unnecessary, and during the last few sessions they were almost entirely abandoned.

Instruments Used to Evaluate the Impact of the Program

1. The Rokeach Value Survey: This scale of values contains eighteen terminal or end values such as freedom, self-respect, equality, a comfortable

life, etc., and eighteen instrumental or character values (ambition, capable, honest, etc.). Each group of values is rank ordered by the subject in terms of the relative importance of this value in his life. Thus for terminal values he must decide whether equality is more important than freedom or whether a comfortable life is more important than salvation. In a similar fashion he must rank character values such as courageous, forgiving, helpful, etc.

Rokeach has reported test-retest reliability coefficients, for time intervals up to seven weeks, of between .78 and .80 for terminal values and between .70 to .72 for instrument values, (Penner, Homant and Rokeach, 1968; Rokeach, 1969).

2. Social Survey Questions: This is a thirty-nine item questionnaire dealing with authoritarian and ethnocentric attitudes. The latter can be broken down into nine items dealing with Negroes and six items dealing with foreigners which were taken, with some modifications, from the California E Scale. Authoritarian attitudes from the Levinson F Scale comprise the major portion of the questionnaire. Items are scored on a six point scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement with the statement in question.

3. Police-Community Attitude Questionnaire: This contains 35 items dealing with an individual's perception of black-white relationships both within the police department as well as between the department and the community. For most items the respondent could rate on a five point scale while on other items only three response alternatives were available. Since many items dealt with the same general area, a total score for these was used in analysis rather than dealing with each statement

separately. Almost all of the statements were taken from a set of questionnaires used by Eisenberg (1970) in the San Francisco Pace Project conducted by the American Institute for Research.

Testing Procedure

All members of a police class were tested during their first week in the academy. Post-testing was done approximately 13 weeks later, usually just a day or two prior to graduation. The explanation for the testing was made by the principal investigator who described it as part of a larger program sponsored by Wayne State University with the support of the police department. The program was described as involving a study of the impact of police training and experience on the values and attitudes of police officers as they became more and more involved in their law enforcement careers. It was also mentioned that a training program might also be established to help police to be better prepared in dealing with complex interpersonal relationships and that some of the cadets might be contacted regarding this. The confidentiality of all test material was strongly stressed with the understanding that no report on any individual would ever be submitted to the department. Instead it was emphasized that only a group result of changes in attitudes, in time, would be sent to their superiors and the day following testing all names would be removed from the tests and code numbers assigned. The men were also told that during their police careers they might probably be contacted again for further measurement of their attitudes to see what changes, if any, had taken place.

Results of Phase I

Effects of Group Experience: White Officers

Tables I and II contain the results of analyses of variance treating pre- and post-test scores on the Rokeach Scale of Values as repeated measures. Only one terminal value in Table I shows a significant difference between experimentals and controls following the group sessions. Experimentals ranked "self-respect" as significantly less important than controls on post-testing ($F=4.15$, significant at the .05 level).

For Instrumental Values in Table II, experimentals also rated "capable" as more important ($F=7.59$, significant at the .01 level), although this result must be examined carefully, since controls initially rated "capable" as far more important than experimentals and the final ratings given by these two groups actually converged and became similar. Thus, experimentals moved from an initial rank of 8.8 to a rank of 7.1, while controls dropped from an initial rank of 5.6 to 7.0. Thus, it is only the direction of the shift which significantly differentiates between groups and it is not the final importance placed on the value itself.

Both experimentals and controls shifted "obedient" to a position of lesser importance at post-testing ($F=28.36$, significant far beyond the .001 level). However, experimentals shifted even more than controls in rating "obedience" as less important, dropping it from a rank of 10.6 to 14.4, while controls dropped from a rank of 11.1 to 12.7. The difference between experimentals and controls was significant at the .05 level ($F=4.44$).

Table III shows the analysis of variance results for other measures. Experimentals became significantly less prejudiced than their controls

TABLE I

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TERMINAL
VALUES OF WHITE EXPERIMENTALS AND E-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
A comfortable life	A Pre-test	12.06	9.83	.79	3.38
	B Post-test	8.00	8.37	15.20**	
An exciting life	A Pre-test	10.06	9.14	2.06	.88
	B Post-test	9.74	7.71	2.16	
A sense of ac- complishment	A Pre-test	6.28	6.20	.01	0.00
	B Post-test	6.40	6.28	.03	
A world at peace	A Pre-test	9.20	7.68	.65	1.11
	B Post-test	9.63	9.40	3.07	
A world of beauty	A Pre-test	13.11	14.03	.06	.09
	B Post-test	13.03	13.63	.21	
Equality	A Pre-test	8.68	8.48	.00	.04
	B Post-test	10.86	10.91	13.70**	
Family Security	A Pre-test	4.80	4.26	1.30	.83
	B Post-test	5.51	4.11	.37	
Freedom	A Pre-test	6.66	5.54	1.31	.03
	B Post-test	6.80	5.86	.19	

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Happiness	A Pre-test	7.08	7.94	.40	.24
	B Post-test	6.94	7.26	.57	
Inner harmony	A Pre-test	9.94	11.23	.34	1.75
	B Post-test	10.71	10.46	.00	
Mature Love	A Pre-test	9.68	9.97	1.33	2.10
	B Post-test	8.46	10.17	1.09	
National Security	A Pre-test	10.51	10.17	.06	.02
	B Post-test	12.06	11.88	7.68**	
Pleasure	A Pre-test	13.54	13.11	1.37	1.79
	B Post-test	12.46	10.80	13.70**	
Salvation	A Pre-test	12.89	14.89	2.78	.20
	B Post-test	13.57	15.20	1.46	
Self-respect	A Pre-test	5.46	6.80	.14	4.15*
	B Post-test	7.03	6.23	.90	
Social recogni- tion	A Pre-test	13.91	11.80	3.34	1.80
	B Post-test	12.91	12.11	.49	
True friendship	A Pre-test	10.37	11.08	2.12	.91
	B Post-test	9.00	10.68	3.03*	

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Wisdom	A Pre-test	6.77	8.83	4.99*	.00
	B Post-test	7.94	9.91	3.78	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE II

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
 INSTRUMENTAL VALUES OF WHITE EXPERIMENTALS
 AND E-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Ambitious	A Pre-test	7.74	5.66	1.53	2.28
	B Post-test	6.54	6.34	.17	
Broadminded	A Pre-test	7.80	7.06	.43	3.63
	B Post-test	7.48	9.43	2.13	
Capable	A Pre-test	8.86	5.66	3.89	7.59**
	B Post-test	7.11	7.00	.13	
Cheerful	A Pre-test	14.31	13.83	.36	.00
	B Post-test	12.68	12.17	6.98*	
Clean	A Pre-test	9.97	10.77	.24	.20
	B Post-test	10.31	10.54	.01	
Courageous	A Pre-test	7.80	7.00	.84	.02
	B Post-test	8.11	7.46	.45	
Forgiving	A Pre-test	10.94	12.88	1.42	1.87
	B Post-test	12.06	12.17	.09	
Helpful	A Pre-test	8.91	10.28	2.08	.04
	B Post-test	9.43	10.54	.36	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Honest	A Pre-test	5.51	5.46	.00	.00
	B Post-test	4.68	4.71	1.81	
Imaginative	A Pre-test	14.48	13.34	.72	.26
	B Post-test	12.94	12.40	4.49*	
Independent	A Pre-test	9.86	8.94	.72	.00
	B Post-test	9.60	8.66	.14	
Intellectual	A Pre-test	10.91	9.80	.64	.17
	B Post-test	10.28	9.74	.24	
Logical	A Pre-test	8.80	8.66	.20	.24
	B Post-test	9.68	8.94	.92	
Loving	A Pre-test	11.08	12.74	3.11	.00
	B Post-test	9.60	11.26	6.10*	
Obedient	A Pre-test	10.57	11.08	.37	4.44*
	B Post-test	14.40	12.74	28.36**	
Polite	A Pre-test	11.20	11.66	.33	.00
	B Post-test	12.54	12.97	5.10*	
Responsible	A Pre-test	6.26	7.08	.01	2.56
	B Post-test	7.11	6.11	.01	

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Self-controlled	A Pre-test	5.97	8.86	6.11*	1.51
	B Post-test	6.40	7.80	.27	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE III

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA
F AND E SCALES AND OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS OF
WHITE EXPERIMENTALS AND E-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Social Survey Questionnaire					
F Scale	A Pre-test	84.77	84.88	.02	.21
	B Post-test	85.34	84.17	.00	
E Scale (Negro)	A Pre-test	20.26	23.60	3.35	.03
	B Post-test	22.88	25.91	8.63**	
E Scale (Foreigner)	A Pre-test	19.66	19.28	.81	5.93*
	B Post-test	17.86	20.37	.36	
Attitude Questionnaire					
Variable					
1. Rel. of blacks and police	A Pre-test	7.63	8.23	.74	1.13
	B Post-test	8.57	8.68	9.38**	
2. Rel. of whites and police	A Pre-test	5.26	5.03	.01	1.00
	B Post-test	5.17	5.34	.33	
3. Rel. black and white police	A Pre-test	5.68	4.91	1.61	.83
	B Post-test	7.34	7.08	45.80**	
4. You and blacks	A Pre-test	4.68	7.48	1.36	.78
	B Post-test	4.83	5.26	.60	

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
5. You and whites	A Pre-test	4.43	6.91	.96	.69
	B Post-test	4.23	4.48	.96	
6. Blacks in police	A Pre-test	7.83	7.57	.43	.31
	B Post-test	7.48	7.40	2.84	
7. Whites in police	A Pre-test	8.08	8.40	.30	1.05
	B Post-test	8.57	8.54	3.53	
8. Are black police equal	A Pre-test	2.68	3.31	4.30*	.30
	B Post-test	2.86	3.28	.16	
9. Contact with blacks	A Pre-test	9.34	7.74	4.71	3.33
	B Post-test	8.31	7.94	1.52	
10. Contact with whites	A Pre-test	17.23	10.97	3.22	2.94
	B Post-test	11.48	11.26	2.41	
11. Police want to know blacks	A Pre-test	1.88	2.28	4.53*	.00
	B Post-test	2.17	2.57	4.03*	
12. Police may abuse citizens	A Pre-test	1.80	1.94	.87	.00
	B Post-test	1.57	1.71	4.58*	
13. Blacks ridi- cule police	A Pre-test	1.86	1.77	.03	1.12
	B Post-test	1.60	1.74	1.74	

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
14. Blacks likely to be criminals	A Pre-test	5.48	5.86	.87	.00
	B Post-test	6.34	6.74	9.93**	
15. Env. creates crime	A Pre-test	4.97	4.31	.66	2.00
	B Post-test	4.54	4.57	.12	
16. Comm. con- trolled by police	A Pre-test	4.08	3.63	4.55*	.38
	B Post-test	4.08	3.43	.38	
17. Separate po- lice-comm. rel. unit	A Pre-test	3.77	3.66	1.20	.44
	B Post-test	4.03	3.68	.68	
18. Blacks assumed guilty	A Pre-test	2.80	2.83	1.25	1.48
	B Post-test	2.14	2.57	7.74**	
19. Police comm. rel. necessary	A Pre-test	1.54	1.31	.00	3.86
	B Post-test	1.46	1.66	1.39	
20. Verbal abuse by police bad	A Pre-test	1.63	1.54	1.95	.61
	B Post-test	1.48	1.20	3.59	
21. Blacks want police pro- tection	A Pre-test	1.94	1.97	.00	.07
	B Post-test	2.20	2.14	1.83	
22. Blacks work hard	A Pre-test	2.20	2.77	1.77	3.70
	B Post-test	2.51	2.57	.18	

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	E-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
23. Separate police asscn. good	A Pre-test	4.60	4.28	2.99	.02
	B Post-test	4.60	4.34	.02	
24. Police bruta- lity exaggerated	A Pre-test	1.83	1.54	.40	2.80
	B Post-test	1.23	1.34	11.20**	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

toward foreigners on the California E (Foreigner) subscale ($F=5.93$, significant at the .05 level). However, there was no difference between experimentals and controls on the E (Negro) subscale as had been predicted. Instead, *both* experimentals and controls became more prejudiced toward blacks on post-testing ($F=8.63$, significant at the .01 level).

No other statistically significant differences between experimentals and controls appeared in the analysis of the other measures for white subjects. Therefore, the essential main difference which emerged for white subjects was a lessened importance placed on "self-respect" and "obedient" by experimentals and a drop in prejudice toward foreigners. A shift in giving greater importance to "capable" by experimentals and a drop in this value for controls was difficult to interpret because of the initial differences between groups in ranking this value.

Experimental Whites versus C-Controls:

One of the concerns which the investigator had at the beginning of the project was that the very introduction of an experimental program into a police class might affect all members of that class whether or not any member had actually participated in the group sessions. For this reason, a special control group was randomly selected from one police class where no group sessions were held. These controls will be referred to as the C-Controls, while controls randomly selected from the same police classes as experimentals will be referred to as E-Controls.

Tables IV, V, and VI contain the results obtained when a similar analysis of variance with repeated measures was conducted comparing white experimentals with controls selected from a police class which contained no experimental groups (C-Controls).

TABLE IV

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TERMINAL
VALUES OF WHITE EXPERIMENTALS AND C-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
A comfortable life	A Pre-test	12.06	10.77	.87	.40
	B Post-test	8.00	7.48	36.11**	
An exciting life	A Pre-test	10.06	9.51	.36	.02
	B Post-test	9.74	9.00	.46	
A sense of ac- complishment	A Pre-test	6.28	5.54	1.89	.55
	B Post-test	6.40	4.91	.26	
A world at peace	A Pre-test	9.20	8.80	.35	.14
	B Post-test	9.63	8.77	.11	
A world of beauty	A Pre-test	13.11	13.23	.14	.13
	B Post-test	13.03	13.54	.04	
Equality	A Pre-test	8.68	9.03	.06	.02
	B Post-test	10.86	11.03	13.44**	
Family security	A Pre-test	4.80	3.86	1.56	.05
	B Post-test	5.51	4.31	1.14	
Freedom	A Pre-test	4.80	4.51	1.47	1.20
	B Post-test	4.46	4.35	1.80	

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Happiness	A Pre-test	7.08	7.00	.19	.51
	B Post-test	6.94	7.71	.23	
Inner Harmony	A Pre-test	9.94	9.51	.06	1.34
	B Post-test	10.71	11.57	6.48*	
Mature love	A Pre-test	9.68	10.31	.89	3.13
	B Post-test	8.46	7.28	17.52**	
National security	A Pre-test	10.51	11.40	.53	.09
	B Post-test	12.06	12.57	4.93*	
Pleasure	A Pre-test	13.54	12.37	.97	.62
	B Post-test	12.46	12.03	2.29	
Salvation	A Pre-test	12.88	14.43	.48	2.26
	B Post-test	13.57	13.66	.01	
Self-respect	A Pre-test	5.46	7.26	1.16	2.77
	B Post-test	7.03	7.00	1.43	
Social recogni- tion	A Pre-test	13.91	13.54	.08	.05
	B Post-test	12.91	12.80	2.29	
True friendship	A Pre-test	10.37	9.14	.00	4.91*
	B Post-test	9.00	10.11	.14	

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Wisdom	A Pre-test	6.77	8.14	1.57	.19
	B Post-test	7.94	8.83	2.86	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE V

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INSTRUMENTAL
VALUES OF WHITE EXPERIMENTALS AND C-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Ambitious	A Pre-test	7.74	7.20	.97	.30
	B Post-test	6.54	5.28	5.80*	
Broadminded	A Pre-test	7.80	8.11	.00	.13
	B Post-test	7.48	7.28	.63	
Capable	A Pre-test	8.86	8.31	1.75	6.20*
	B Post-test	7.11	9.83	.03	
Cheerful	A Pre-test	14.31	12.68	3.26	.14
	B Post-test	12.68	11.51	5.28*	
Clean	A Pre-test	9.97	10.94	.10	.90
	B Post-test	10.31	10.00	.19	
Courageous	A Pre-test	7.80	8.14	.05	.06
	B Post-test	8.11	8.14	.06	
Forgiving	A Pre-test	10.94	9.68	.22	1.70
	B Post-test	12.06	12.48	9.17*	
Helpful	A Pre-test	8.91	8.00	.14	.76
	B Post-test	9.43	9.63	2.82	

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Honest	A Pre-test	5.51	4.17	.42	2.06
	B Post-test	4.68	5.08	.00	
Imaginative	A Pre-test	14.48	13.34	.41	.84
	B Post-test	12.94	12.94	2.43	
Independent	A Pre-test	9.86	11.37	.33	1.40
	B Post-test	9.60	9.28	2.29	
Intellectual	A Pre-test	10.91	11.28	.04	.03
	B Post-test	10.28	10.37	.99	
Logical	A Pre-test	8.80	10.00	.70	.36
	B Post-test	9.68	10.08	.53	
Loving	A Pre-test	11.08	9.57	1.29	.20
	B Post-test	9.60	8.68	3.16	
Obedient	A Pre-test	10.57	11.86	.15	3.31
	B Post-test	14.40	13.71	27.57**	
Polite	A Pre-test	11.20	11.14	.03	.01
	B Post-test	12.54	12.34	4.27*	
Responsible	A Pre-test	6.26	7.43	.54	.89
	B Post-test	7.11	7.17	.26	

TABLE V (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post.	A x B F ratios
Self-controlled	A Pre-test	5.97	7.74	2.49	.52
	B Post-test	6.40	7.14	.01	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE VI

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA
F AND E SCALES AND OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS OF
WHITE EXPERIMENTALS AND C-CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Social Survey Questionnaire					
F Scale	A Pre-test	84.77	88.91	.18	3.18
	B Post-test	85.34	84.31	1.93	
E Scale (Negro)	A Pre-test	20.26	22.46	.09	4.27*
	B Post-test	22.88	21.80	1.54	
E Scale (Foreigner)	A Pre-test	19.66	19.34	.00	.37
	B Post-test	17.86	18.17	8.37**	
Attitude Questionnaire					
Variable					
1. Rel. of blacks and police	A Pre-test	7.63	8.94	.84	13.93**
	B Post-test	8.57	8.03	.00	
2. Rel. of whites and police	A Pre-test	5.26	6.11	4.06*	1.58
	B Post-test	5.17	5.54	2.89	
3. Rel. black and white police	A Pre-test	5.68	5.91	5.38*	15.32**
	B Post-test	7.34	5.43	4.58*	
4. You and blacks	A Pre-test	4.68	4.80	.09	.04
	B Post-test	4.82	4.88	.59	

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
5. You and whites	A Pre-test	4.43	4.37	.19	1.15
	B Post-test	4.23	4.51	.03	
6. Blacks in police treated	A Pre-test	7.83	7.51	1.77	.00
	B Post-test	7.48	7.17	5.72*	
7. Whites in police treated	A Pre-test	8.08	8.34	.74	.08
	B Post-test	8.57	8.71	4.73*	
8. Are black police equal	A Pre-test	2.68	2.83	.07	.42
	B Post-test	2.86	2.83	.42	
9. Contact with blacks	A Pre-test	9.34	7.66	4.12*	4.86*
	B Post-test	8.31	7.88	1.97	
10. Contact with whites	A Pre-test	17.23	12.97	1.06	.84
	B Post-test	11.48	11.20	3.02	
11. Police want to know blacks	A Pre-test	1.88	2.20	.54	2.00
	B Post-test	2.17	2.11	.58	
12. Police may abuse citizens	A Pre-test	1.80	2.37	5.35*	1.94
	B Post-test	1.57	1.77	9.66**	
13. Blacks ridicule police	A Pre-test	1.86	1.88	.68	.95
	B Post-test	1.60	1.88	.95	

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
14. Blacks likely to be criminals	A Pre-test	5.48	6.20	.03	3.99*
	B Post-test	6.34	5.77	.44	
15. Env. creates crime	A Pre-test	4.97	4.20	2.23	.68
	B Post-test	4.54	4.20	.68	
16. Comm. controlled police	A Pre-test	4.08	4.00	.45	2.10
	B Post-test	4.08	4.46	2.80	
17. Separate police-comm. rel. unit	A Pre-test	3.77	3.68	.00	.41
	B Post-test	4.03	4.14	5.26*	
18. Blacks assumed guilty	A Pre-test	2.80	2.66	.98	5.27*
	B Post-test	2.14	2.74	3.12	
19. Police comm. rel. necessary	A Pre-test	1.54	1.26	.21	2.87
	B Post-test	1.46	1.57	.94	
20. Verbal abuse by police bad	A Pre-test	1.63	1.43	.17	.79
	B Post-test	1.48	1.54	.01	
21. Blacks want police protection	A Pre-test	1.94	2.20	.11	2.58
	B Post-test	2.20	1.80	.12	
22. Blacks work hard	A Pre-test	2.20	2.54	.02	6.69**
	B Post-test	2.51	2.11	.16	

TABLE VI (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
23. Separate police associ- ations good	A Pre-test	4.60	4.74	.99	.00
	B Post-test	4.60	4.74	.00	
24. Police brutality exaggerated	A Pre-test	1.83	1.28	4.49*	7.09**
	B Post-test	1.23	1.28	7.09**	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

On Terminal Values, the differences obtained are quite minimal and Table IV reveals that the only new difference between experimentals and C-Controls is the greater emphasis which the former now seem to place on "true friendship" ($F=4.91$, significant at the .05 level). The significant difference found previously between experimentals and controls for "self-respect" drops out, although the insignificant F of 2.26 is still in the same direction as before with experimentals giving less significance to this value on post-testing when compared to their controls.

On Instrumental Values, (see Table V), "capable" again significantly differentiated between experimentals and controls ($F=6.20$, significant at the .05 level) with experimentals placing greater value on this following the group sessions. There was also a tendency for experimentals to lower the value of "obedience" more than controls, which is similar to the previous analysis, but this F of 3.31 fails to meet the level required for statistical significance. Again, however, both experimentals and controls are found to downgrade the importance of this value, even though the former seem to be especially prone to do this, and the overall shift for both groups is highly significant ($F=27.57$, significant far beyond the .001 level).

The suspicion that the introduction of an experimental program might affect all members of a police class where groups were run seems to be rather clearly supported, especially by the results obtained in Table VI, where experimentals and the C-Controls are compared on the Social Survey Questions and the other attitude questionnaire items. Unfortunately, the results are, in all cases, in the opposite direction to that which would have been predicted. Thus, the group program seems to have resulted not only in sensitizing the white officers to black-white problems, but it

seems to have increased negative feelings toward blacks as well. Reference to Table VI, therefore, reveals a significant difference between experimentals and C-Controls on the California E Scale toward Negroes ($F=4.27$, significant at the .05 level). However, the direction of change indicated by the means reveals that experimentals became *more prejudiced* toward Negroes, while controls became less prejudiced.

The results obtained on other measures supports this finding even further. Thus, on Variable 1 of the attitude questionnaire, experimentals feel stronger than controls that the relationships between blacks and police is even poorer at post-testing than they had at pre-testing ($F=13.93$, significant at the .01 level). They also feel that the relationship between black and white police officers is poorer (Variable 3-- $F=15.32$, significant at the .01 level). In addition, they also report having less contact with blacks than they had previously (Variable 9-- $F=4.86$, significant at the .05 level) and they feel even more strongly at post-testing that blacks are more likely than whites to be involved in criminal behavior (Variable 14-- $F=3.99$, significant at the .05 level). In line with this, experimentals also agree more strongly with the proposition that blacks are assumed to be guilty more often than whites because they are involved more often in criminal behavior (Variable 18-- $F=5.27$, significant at the .05 level). In addition they even disagree, more than they had previously, with the propositions that blacks work hard (Variable 22-- $F=6.69$, significant at the .05 level) and they feel more strongly than their controls that reports of police brutality are more often due to misinformation or misunderstanding (Variable 24-- $F=7.09$, significant at the .01 level).

Thus, the overwhelming weight of evidence points to the conclusion that the introduction of the experimental program itself affected all members of the police classes where groups were run, regardless of whether or not a member was actually involved in attending group sessions. Secondly, and even more importantly, there is strong evidence that the result of the program among these police classes was a backlash effect which resulted in more negative attitudes toward blacks, rather than creating a more positive shift, as had been initially predicted.

The impact of the program on all members of the police classes where it was introduced can further be examined by comparing controls from the "experimental classes" with controls selected from the "non-experimental class." These results are reported in Tables VII, VIII, and IX.

The results from the Terminal Value Scale when E-Controls and C-Controls are compared in Table VII do not provide an entirely consistent picture with that found when experimentals and C-Controls were compared. For example E-Controls are found to place greater value than C-Controls on "inner harmony" ($F=6.39$, significant at the .05 level), while they place less value on "mature love" ($F=9.38$, significant at the .01 level). These differences bear little resemblance to those found between experimentals and C-Controls and, therefore, do not seem to reflect some overall impact on experimental classes. They are thus difficult to interpret.

Neither are there any differences in Instrumental Values between E-Controls and C-Controls which are similar to those found between experimentals and C-Controls. Instead, Table VIII reveals that E-Controls are found to place greater value on "ambitions" ($F=4.65$, significant at the .05 level) and on "forgiving" ($F=7.64$, significant at the .01 level) than C-Controls, while they placed less value on "broadminded" ($F=6.62$,

TABLE VII

REPEATED MEASURES, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
 TERMINAL VALUES OF WHITE E-CONTROLS AND
 C-CONTROLS

		E-Control N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A X B F ratios
A comfortable life	A Pre-test	9.83	10.77	.00	1.71
	B Post-test	8.37	7.48	11.53**	
An exciting life	A Pre-test	9.14	9.51	.69	.56
	B Post-test	7.71	9.00	2.55	
A sense of ac- complishment	A Pre-test	6.20	5.54	1.54	.46
	B Post-test	6.28	4.91	.26	
A world at peace	A Pre-test	7.68	8.80	.05	1.85
	B Post-test	9.40	8.77	1.73	
A world of beauty	A Pre-test	14.03	13.23	.30	.57
	B Post-test	13.63	13.54	.01	
Equality	A Pre-test	8.48	9.03	.11	.13
	B Post-test	10.91	11.03	14.09**	
Family Security	A Pre-test	4.26	3.86	.02	.31
	B Post-test	4.11	4.31	.09	
Freedom	A Pre-test	5.54	7.14	5.87*	1.30
	B Post-test	5.86	8.57	3.19	

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

		E-Control N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Happiness	A Pre-test	7.94	7.00	.08	1.32
	B Post-test	7.26	7.71	.00	
Inner Harmony	A Pre-test	11.23	9.51	.11	6.39*
	B Post-test	10.46	11.57	1.32	
Mature Love	A Pre-test	9.97	10.31	2.20	9.38**
	B Post-test	10.17	7.28	7.20**	
National Security	A Pre-test	10.17	11.40	.93	.28
	B Post-test	11.88	12.57	7.81**	
Pleasure	A Pre-test	13.11	12.37	.07	3.66
	B Post-test	10.80	12.03	6.65*	
Salvation	A Pre-test	14.88	14.43	.94	1.52
	B Post-test	15.20	13.66	.27	
Self-respect	A Pre-test	6.80	7.26	.59	.11
	B Post-test	6.23	7.00	.79	
Social recognition	A Pre-test	11.80	13.54	1.80	1.07
	B Post-test	12.11	12.80	.18	
True Friendship	A Pre-test	11.08	9.14	2.57	1.71
	B Post-test	10.68	10.11	.30	

TABLE VII (CONTINUED)

		E-Control N = 35 Means	C-Control N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Wisdom	A Pre-test	8.83	8.14	.87	.11
	B Post-test	9.91	8.83	2.22	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE VIII
 REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR
 INSTRUMENTAL VALUES OF WHITE E-CONTROLS
 AND C-CONTROLS

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Ambitious	A Pre-test	5.66	7.20	.09	4.65*
	B Post-test	6.34	5.28	1.04	
Broadminded	A Pre-test	7.06	8.11	.36	6.62*
	B Post-test	9.43	7.28	1.54	
Capable	A Pre-test	5.66	8.31	10.63**	.02
	B Post-test	7.00	9.83	5.65*	
Cheerful	A Pre-test	13.83	12.68	1.01	.18
	B Post-test	12.17	11.51	6.28*	
Clean	A Pre-test	10.77	10.94	.03	.30
	B Post-test	10.54	10.00	.80	
Courageous	A Pre-test	7.00	8.14	1.20	.13
	B Post-test	7.46	8.14	.13	
Forgiving	A Pre-test	12.88	9.68	2.33	7.64**
	B Post-test	12.17	12.48	2.69	
Helpful	A Pre-test	10.28	8.00	2.64	1.27
	B Post-test	10.54	9.63	2.40	

TABLE VIII (CONTINUED)

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Honest	A Pre-test	5.46	4.17	.39	2.18
	B Post-test	4.71	5.08	.02	
Imaginative	A Pre-test	13.34	13.34	.00	.19
	B Post-test	12.40	12.94	1.21	
Independent	A Pre-test	8.94	11.37	2.03	1.27
	B Post-test	8.66	9.28	2.21	
Intellectual	A Pre-test	9.80	11.28	1.09	.34
	B Post-test	9.74	10.37	.44	
Logical	A Pre-test	8.66	10.00	1.92	.02
	B Post-test	8.94	10.08	.09	
Loving	A Pre-test	12.74	9.57	7.71**	.28
	B Post-test	11.26	8.68	4.30*	
Obedient	A Pre-test	11.08	11.86	.90	.03
	B Post-test	12.74	13.71	9.16**	
Polite	A Pre-test	11.66	11.14	.51	.01
	B Post-test	12.97	12.34	5.39*	
Responsible	A Pre-test	7.08	7.43	.83	.29
	B Post-test	6.11	7.17	.85	

TABLE VIII (CONTINUED)

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Self-controlled	A Pre-test	8.86	7.74	.96	.11
	B Post-test	7.80	7.14	1.40	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE IX

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA

F AND E SCALES AND OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS OF

WHITE E-CONTROLS AND C-CONTROLS

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Social Survey Questions					
F Scale	A Pre-test	84.88	88.91	.32	2.13
	B Post-test	84.17	84.31	3.99*	
E Scale (Negro)	A Pre-test	23.60	22.47	1.99	3.85
	B Post-test	25.91	21.80	1.19	
E Scale (Foreigner)	A Pre-test	19.28	19.34	.86	4.00*
	B Post-test	20.37	18.17	.00	
Attitude Questionnaire					
Variable					
1. Rel. of blacks and police	A Pre-test	8.23	8.94	.00	12.48**
	B Post-test	8.68	8.03	1.38	
2. Rel. of whites and police	A Pre-test	5.03	6.11	5.18*	4.71*
	B Post-test	5.34	5.54	.40	
3. Rel. of black and white police	A Pre-test	4.91	5.91	.77	30.70**
	B Post-test	7.08	5.43	12.35**	
4. You and blacks	A Pre-test	7.48	4.80	1.22	.74
	B Post-test	5.26	4.88	.64	

TABLE IX (CONTINUED)

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
5. You and whites	A Pre-test	6.91	4.37	.81	.92
	B Post-test	4.48	4.51	.73	
6. Blacks in police	A Pre-test	7.57	7.51	.25	.39
	B Post-test	7.40	7.17	3.54	
7. Whites in police	A Pre-test	8.40	8.34	.04	.34
	B Post-test	8.54	8.71	1.76	
8. Are black police equal	A Pre-test	3.31	2.83	2.78	.01
	B Post-test	3.28	2.83	.01	
9. Contact with blacks	A Pre-test	7.74	7.66	.02	.00
	B Post-test	7.94	7.88	.50	
10. Contact with whites	A Pre-test	10.97	12.97	.50	.61
	B Post-test	11.26	11.20	.32	
11. Police want to know blacks	A Pre-test	2.28	2.20	2.28	2.28
	B Post-test	2.57	2.11	.66	
12. Police may abuse citi- zens	A Pre-test	1.94	2.37	1.71	1.99
	B Post-test	1.71	1.77	9.89**	
13. Blacks ridi- cule police	A Pre-test	1.77	1.88	.39	.01
	B Post-test	1.74	1.88	.01	

TABLE IX (CONTINUED)

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
14. Blacks likely to be criminals	A Pre-test	5.86	6.20	.60	5.35*
	B Post-test	6.74	5.77	.65	
15. Env. creates crime	A Pre-test	4.31	4.20	.47	.20
	B Post-test	4.57	4.20	.20	
16. Comm. con- trolled police	A Pre-test	3.63	4.00	9.46**	3.29
	B Post-test	3.43	4.46	.50	
17. Separate police-comm. rel. unit	A Pre-test	3.66	3.68	1.19	1.61
	B Post-test	3.68	4.14	2.07	
18. Blacks assumed guilty	A Pre-test	2.83	2.66	.00	.96
	B Post-test	2.57	2.74	.24	
19. Police comm. rel. necessary	A Pre-test	1.31	1.26	.14	.02
	B Post-test	1.66	1.57	8.36**	
20. Verbal abuse by police bad	A Pre-test	1.54	1.43	.66	5.03*
	B Post-test	1.20	1.54	1.26	
21. Blacks want police protection	A Pre-test	1.97	2.20	.06	3.43
	B Post-test	2.14	1.80	.55	
22. Blacks work hard	A Pre-test	2.77	2.54	1.78	.78
	B Post-test	2.57	2.11	5.86*	

TABLE IX (CONTINUED)

		E-Controls N = 35 Means	C-Controls N = 35 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
23. Separate po- lice associa- tions good	A Pre-test	4.28	4.74	6.78*	.02
	B Post-test	4.36	4.74	.02	
24. Police bru- tality exaggerated	A Pre-test	1.54	1.28	1.78	1.00
	B Post-test	1.34	1.28	1.00	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

significant at the .05 level). Again, these seem inconsistent from the results obtained when experimentals and E-Controls were compared and they, too, are difficult to interpret. One conclusion which is suggested, however, is that the Rokeach Scale of Values may not have been as sensitive and reliable an instrument as the more direct attitude measures in reflecting changes taking place as a result of the experimental program or the group sessions.

In line with this, Table IX indicates that the more direct measures of attitudes do show more consistency in their results. Thus, many significant differences can be found, when E-Controls and C-Controls are compared, which are quite similar to those found when experimentals and C-Controls were analyzed. Indeed, almost all differences found previously can be seen here. In this respect, E-Controls are found to be more prejudiced toward Negroes on the California E (Negro) Scale when compared to C-Controls, although the obtained F ratio of 3.85 just fails to meet the level required for statistical significance. However, unlike the experimentals, E-Controls also became significantly more prejudiced toward foreigners on the E Scale ($F=4.00$, significant at the .05 level). Similar to the experimentals, they felt that the relationship between blacks and police was poorer at post-testing (Variable 1-- $F=12.48$, significant at the .01 level) when compared to C-Controls. They also felt that the relationship between whites and police was poorer (Variable 2-- $F=4.71$, significant at the .05 level) and they especially felt that black and white police did not get along well together (Variable 3-- $F=30.70$, significant at the .001 level). Like the experimentals, E-Controls also believed more strongly that blacks are more likely to be criminals (Variable 14-- $F=5.35$, significant at the .05 level). However, they also felt

more in agreement with the statement that verbal abuse by police is bad (Variable 20-- $F=5.03$, significant at the .05 level).

Thus, on the whole, one can again see that all members of police classes, where experimental programs were run, became highly sensitized to black-white problems, and, unfortunately, for the most part this seemed to result in a more negative view of blacks than was previously held. As mentioned, this reaction seemed even stronger among experimentals who participated in the actual group sessions, at least on some issues.

Effect of Group Experience: Black Officers

The results of the analyses of variance in Tables X, XI, and XII reveal that black experimentals showed greater changes, when compared to their controls, than white experimentals. Some of these differences were even in the direction predicted for white officers. Thus, Table X reveals that black group members rated "equality" as significantly more important than their controls following the group experience ($F=5.09$, significant at the .05 level). They also placed a higher value on "a world at peace" than controls ($F=6.12$, significant at the .01 level). Also of interest is the finding that, similar to whites, black experimentals rate "self-respect" as less important following the group sessions, although the obtained F of 3.03 fails to meet the level required for statistical significance and can only be considered a strong trend.

Experimentals also showed a significantly different shift on "national security" in comparison to controls, although both groups rated it as less important on post-testing. However, it is difficult to interpret the greater drop in importance for this value by controls ($F=5.96$, significant at the .05 level), since experimentals and controls started out at

TABLE X

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TERMINAL
VALUES OF BLACK EXPERIMENTALS AND CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
A comfortable life	A Pre-test	10.38	11.07	.07	.04
	B Post-test	7.61	7.85	7.10**	
An exciting life	A Pre-test	11.85	12.85	.23	.05
	B Post-test	11.08	11.69	1.28	
A sense of accom- plishment	A Pre-test	8.54	8.23	.50	1.45
	B Post-test	7.00	9.15	.09	
A world at peace	A Pre-test	7.15	6.85	1.54	6.12**
	B Post-test	7.46	12.46	7.62**	
A world of beauty	A Pre-test	13.38	13.92	.38	.11
	B Post-test	13.61	14.69	.37	
Equality	A Pre-test	4.92	5.38	1.84	5.09*
	B Post-test	3.23	6.54	.18	
Family Security	A Pre-test	4.61	3.00	1.35	.72
	B Post-test	4.54	4.00	.52	
Freedom	A Pre-test	5.69	7.08	.00	3.28
	B Post-test	8.08	6.69	1.71	

TABLE X (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Happiness	A Pre-test	9.00	8.08	.02	.97
	B Post-test	7.31	8.69	.21	
Inner Harmony	A Pre-test	10.69	11.00	.31	1.33
	B Post-test	11.31	9.54	.22	
Mature Love	A Pre-test	8.85	9.23	.10	2.47
	B Post-test	10.38	9.08	1.65	
National Security	A Pre-test	12.69	9.61	.29	5.96*
	B Post-test	<u>13.31</u>	14.54	9.85**	
Pleasure	A Pre-test	13.69	13.31	1.25	2.29
	B Post-test	12.54	9.77	8.88**	
Salvation	A Pre-test	11.00	12.62	.03	1.14
	B Post-test	11.85	10.92	.13	
Self-respect	A Pre-test	6.54	7.23	.16	3.03
	B Post-test	8.08	6.31	.19	
Social recogni- tion	A Pre-test	12.61	13.69	.00	3.24
	B Post-test	13.38	12.23	.31	
True friendship	A Pre-test	13.38	10.38	4.76*	.02
	B Post-test	12.15	9.38	1.49	

TABLE X (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Wisdom	A Pre-test	6.00	7.46	.09	3.20
	B Post-test	8.08	7.46	.10	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

TABLE XI

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INSTRUMENTAL
VALUES OF BLACK EXPERIMENTALS AND CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Ambitious	A Pre-test	6.46	8.46	.55	.27
	B Post-test	6.08	6.77	.68	
Broadminded	A Pre-test	6.46	8.38	.30	.85
	B Post-test	8.62	8.23	.64	
Capable	A Pre-test	10.15	9.54	.08	.02
	B Post-test	9.61	9.31	.10	
Cheerful	A Pre-test	10.85	12.46	.90	.03
	B Post-test	11.00	12.31	.00	
Clean	A Pre-test	4.76	3.93	.08	.83
	B Post-test	3.84	4.23	1.17	
Courageous	A Pre-test	9.69	8.23	2.53	.45
	B Post-test	9.92	6.85	.23	
Forgiving	A Pre-test	12.77	10.23	.34	3.76
	B Post-test	11.92	13.15	1.14	
Helpful	A Pre-test	9.54	8.23	.07	1.94
	B Post-test	6.85	9.00	.60	

TABLE XI (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Honest	A Pre-test	5.00	4.61	.00	.16
	B Post-test	4.00	4.23	.82	
Imaginative	A Pre-test	11.46	14.46	5.90*	.10
	B Post-test	11.61	13.85	.04	
Independent	A Pre-test	10.00	11.00	.04	1.25
	B Post-test	11.31	9.61	.00	
Intellectual	A Pre-test	8.31	13.46	2.11	9.11**
	B Post-test	10.46	10.38	.28	
Logical	A Pre-test	12.62	12.38	.45	2.45
	B Post-test	13.15	10.85	.57	
Loving	A Pre-test	11.00	11.15	1.29	2.96
	B Post-test	7.08	10.92	3.74	
Obedient	A Pre-test	13.31	10.15	.93	2.97
	B Post-test	12.69	12.69	1.10	
Polite	A Pre-test	9.85	9.92	.00	.00
	B Post-test	11.69	11.61	2.17	
Responsible	A Pre-test	6.69	5.69	.75	.00
	B Post-test	8.92	7.85	3.70	

TABLE XI (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Control N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Self-controlled	A Pre-test	9.77	4.31	6.48*	5.24*
	B Post-test	6.69	4.92	2.33	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

different initial levels with experimentals shifting from a rank of 12.6 to 13.3, while controls shifted from a rank of 9.6 to 14.5. Thus, their post-test ranks converged, ending at approximately the same level, even though the extent of the shift by controls was greater.

On Instrumental Values, shown in Table XI, a difference in the extent of shift between experimentals and controls also appeared for "intellectual" ($F=9.11$, significant at the .01 level). However, as with "national security," it is difficult to interpret this, since their initial ranks were so different. Experimentals began with a rank of 8.3, while controls began at 13.5. Both groups then shifted to a rank of 10 on post-testing. "Self-control" also differentiated between experimentals and controls ($F=5.24$, significant at the .05 level), but, again, both groups differed initially. Experimentals rated it as more important, moving from a rank of 9.8 to 6.7 while controls shifted from 4.3 to 4.9. Since controls ended up still rating this value as more important than experimentals, it is, again, difficult to interpret.

Major differences between experimentals and controls also appeared on the other measures used. Table XII reveals that experimentals perceived relationships between black and white officers as improved, following the group experience, while their controls felt it was worse (Variable 3-- $F=11.31$, significant at the .01 level). Controls report more positive feeling toward other blacks than previously, when compared to experimentals, (Variable 4-- $F=9.48$, significant at the .01 level) and, conversely, they report more negative feelings toward whites than experimentals (Variable 5-- $F=5.63$, significant at the .05 level). Perhaps related to these findings is the tendency for experimentals to report even less contact with other blacks, following the groups, in comparison

TABLE XII

REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA
F AND E SCALES AND OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS OF
BLACK EXPERIMENTALS AND CONTROLS

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Controls N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
Social Survey Questionnaire					
F Scale	A Pre-test	84.61	84.00	.15	1.03
	B Post-test	77.54	72.85	20.63**	
E Scale (Negro)	A Pre-test	14.31	14.62	.16	.80
	B Post-test	14.62	13.15	.34	
E Scale (Foreigner)	A Pre-test	18.92	19.23	.13	.91
	B Post-test	15.77	15.85	6.01*	
Attitude Questionnaire					
Variable					
1. Rel. of blacks and police	A Pre-test	7.46	8.15	1.33	.43
	B Post-test	7.85	9.08	2.52	
2. Rel. of whites and police	A Pre-test	4.46	5.23	2.18	.02
	B Post-test	4.77	5.46	.92	
3. Rel. black and white police	A Pre-test	6.08	6.23	4.16*	11.31**
	B Post-test	6.00	8.85	10.05**	

TABLE XII (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Controls N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
4. You and blacks	A Pre-test	2.62	2.85	1.12	9.48**
	B Post-test	3.08	2.31	.06	
5. You and whites	A Pre-test	3.92	3.62	.40	5.63*
	B Post-test	3.92	5.00	5.63*	
6. Blacks in police	A Pre-test	8.62	8.31	.40	2.92
	B Post-test	9.38	10.15	17.21**	
7. Whites in police	A Pre-test	7.15	6.77	2.24	.96
	B Post-test	6.69	5.77	7.06*	
8. Are black police equal	A Pre-test	2.00	2.23	1.81	.29
	B Post-test	2.15	2.62	1.57	
9. Contact with blacks	A Pre-test	11.31	11.46	1.57	4.34*
	B Post-test	10.38	12.92	.22	
10. Contact with whites	A Pre-test	9.15	10.77	2.58	.03
	B Post-test	7.85	9.23	4.94*	
11. Police want to know blacks	A Pre-test	2.85	2.31	.00	2.71
	B Post-test	2.15	2.61	.40	
12. Police may abuse citizens	A Pre-test	2.00	1.77	.31	.08
	B Post-test	1.31	1.23	4.92*	

TABLE XII (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Controls N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
13. Blacks ridi- cule police	A Pre-test	2.69	2.08	1.52	.41
	B Post-test	2.23	2.08	.41	
14. Blacks likely to be criminals	A Pre-test	4.46	4.46	.28	.71
	B Post-test	5.08	5.85	4.79*	
15. Environ. creates crime	A Pre-test	5.46	5.54	.17	.58
	B Post-test	5.46	4.77	.58	
16. Commun. controlled police	A Pre-test	4.23	3.54	1.87	.06
	B Post-test	3.92	3.38	.55	
17. Separate police-comm. rel. unit	A Pre-test	3.54	3.00	.00	2.23
	B Post-test	2.77	3.31	.41	
18. Blacks assumed to be guilty	A Pre-test	3.15	3.00	.16	.01
	B Post-test	2.08	1.85	10.13**	
19. Police-comm. rel. necessary	A Pre-test	1.62	1.46	.63	.08
	B Post-test	1.69	1.38	.00	
20. Verbal abuse by police bad	A Pre-test	1.61	1.69	.02	.03
	B Post-test	1.23	1.23	3.94	
21. Blacks want police protection	A Pre-test	2.15	1.31	9.58**	.47
	B Post-test	1.69	1.08	4.26*	

TABLE XII (CONTINUED)

		Exper. N = 13 Means	Controls N = 13 Means	F ratios for Pre- and Post	A x B F ratios
22. Blacks work hard	A Pre-test	2.08	1.46	3.58	.30
	B Post-test	1.62	1.23	2.72	
23. Separate police associ- ations good	A Pre-test	4.31	4.38	.17	.82
	B Post-test	3.85	3.38	6.03*	
24. Police brutality exaggerated	A Pre-test	2.61	2.23	.15	.43
	B Post-test	2.15	2.31	.22	

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

to their controls, who report even more contact with blacks than previously (Variable 9-- $F=4.34$, significant at the .05 level). Experimentals do not, however, report any corresponding increase in their contact with whites, following the group experience.

Because there were insufficient blacks in the one police class which contained no group procedures, it was impossible to test whether black controls had become sensitized to racial problems in the same way as white controls were found to be affected. However, the many differences already reported between experimentals and controls would certainly suggest that this did not happen. In addition, inspection of the few cases available in the one class which contained no group procedures did not reveal any trends similar to the whites.

Summary of Changes following Group Sessions for Black and White Officers:

Evidence strongly indicates that positive changes took place in the attitudes of black officers following group experience. Black experimentals became even more highly sensitized to "equality" as a value and, perhaps related to this, was the greater importance which they gave "a world at peace," which suggests increased social concern. Even more important were the more direct positive expressions of feeling by black experimentals toward whites. They appeared to see better relationships existing between black and white officers and they seemed to feel closer to whites than their controls, who, instead, felt an even greater sense of alienation than before.

In contrast to all this, there is equal evidence that the group program produced negative results among white officers. Indeed, the results also strongly suggest the conclusion that not only was there a backlash

effect among participating experimentals, but that the very introduction of the program into a police class had an impact on every member of that class whether or not he even attended group sessions. This impact reflected itself in terms of a more heightened sensitivity to the existence of black-white problems, both within the police force, and between the force and the black community. It also, unfortunately, seemed to be accompanied by increased prejudice toward Negroes.

Results from the Rokeach Scale of Values suggest that "self-respect" assumes less importance as a value, following the groups, regardless of whether participants were black or white. However, in only the latter case was the difference of sufficient magnitude to reach the required level for statistical significance. A greater emphasis on "capable" also seemed to characterize white experimentals. However, there appeared to be no consistent results, on the scale of values, which reflected any overall impact on all whites who were in police classes containing the experimental group sessions. Instead it seemed to be the more direct attitudinal measures which gave the most consistent results. These, as mentioned, all pointed toward an increase in negative feelings towards blacks.

Discussion of Results

The only changes which seemed to differentiate experimentals from controls, and which would reflect the effects of the group experience alone, was the greater emphasis placed on "capable" and the decrease in importance given to "self-respect" by all group members, both black and white, prior to graduation. This, together with their greater rejection

of "obedient" could reflect some increase in strivings toward greater competence and effectiveness with a corresponding decrease in the need for approval of others as a basis for self-acceptance. This is, of course quite speculative, since it is difficult to interpret just what shifts of this nature really signify. Since the focus of the groups was essentially on black-white, intra-group relationships, with an attempt to promote greater self-awareness and increased sensitivity to the behavior of others, it is difficult to see how shifts in the values mentioned could directly reflect these goals. Certainly two of the primary aims of T-groups (Schein and Bennis, 1965) should be an increase in the feeling of being oneself along with a corresponding decrease in feeling compelled to play a role for others. This supposedly helps one to act more collaboratively in interpersonal relations rather than in authoritative or hierarchial terms. One could therefore argue that the placement of "capable" in a higher position and "self-respect" in a lower position could reflect a shift in the direction of greater inner freedom and autonomy. It would be more difficult to interpret the downgrading of "obedient" as a rejection of more hierarchial relationships by group members alone; however, since there was a marked tendency for every police officer to lower the importance of this value following their police training, this may more likely be a reaction to the strict discipline maintained in the academy. The more hedonistic, pleasure, comfortable life orientation which characterizes all officers, prior to graduation, supports this to some extent.

Neither is it possible to put too much faith in the significantly lower scores on the California E Scale towards foreigners obtained by white experimentals when compared to controls. First, if this truly reflected a more positive shift in attitude towards members of an out-group

It should have been present when experimentals were compared to either E-Controls or C-Controls. Indeed, an examination of the means shows that this result is entirely due to an unexplained negative shift towards foreigners among the E-Controls rather than to a more positive shift by experimentals. It may therefore actually be a hostile generalization effect which the group sessions were able to impede to some extent.

Thus, it becomes very difficult to point to any results obtained from white officers which can be used as indications that the group program produced some positive changes. There is no question, however, that both the group sessions, as well as the very presence of the experimental program within police classes, resulted in a great deal of sensitization to the existence of black-white problems, both within the department and between the department and the black community. Unfortunately, not only were members more ready to admit to the existence of these black-white issues, but this was accompanied by an increase in negative feelings towards blacks. They became significantly more prejudiced towards Negroes on the California E Scale and were more prone to feel that blacks were lazier and more criminally oriented than whites. They also tended to feel that complaints of police brutality were far too often the result of exaggeration. This was true in spite of their willingness to admit that some police are guilty of verbal and physical abuse and it seems to represent an admission at one moment and a denial the next.

What we seem to see here then is the defensive emergence of rage as threat is perceived. Similar reactions have been reported as explanations for increases in prejudice towards minority groups (Allport and Kramer, 1946; Allport, 1954). This finding is also identical to that reported by Kephart (1957) who reported that those white police, in his study, who

felt that a problem existed between black and white police officers, were more likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward Negro police. He attributed this to projection on the part of white officers who, because of their hostility towards blacks, were therefore more prone to see problems between white and black officers. Quite probably these attitudes also work in a circular fashion and are self-reinforcing.

Amir (1969) has made an exhaustive search of the literature dealing with the many apparent contradictory results which have emerged from contact or interaction studies. He comments on the fact that many of these investigations have been guided by what he refers to as a rather naive assumption that mere contact between people or increased interaction alone, will change the feelings and beliefs that these people hold towards one another in a more positive direction. As Amir points out, such a view is based on the premise that man is basically "good" and if only given the opportunity he will seek mutual understanding and hence will come to appreciate others more. However, the research has failed to support such a simplistic view of how human beings come to hold and modify attitudes toward out-groups. One clear fact which seems to emerge from his review is that "when contact between groups is to the disadvantage of one of them (i.e. economic disadvantage, lowered prestige or status level, etc.), not only does this contact not reduce prejudice, but it may even intensify intergroup hatred and violence (page 329)." He cites studies by Sherif (1966), Kramer (1950) and Winder (1952) which showed that when there was no mutual concern or common goal shared by both the majority and the minority group, increased contact served no positive function whatsoever in modifying attitudes and indeed often created changes in the opposite

direction. Thus he concludes that cooperative factors further intergroup relations while competitive factors hinder them.

This observation seems to have relevance in the present study since the effects of the group experience, and the impact of the very presence of these groups on the police classes from which they were drawn, probably depends upon how the program was perceived by all individuals concerned. Was it seen as a program motivated entirely for the benefit of one group of persons (i.e. black officers) with a possible disadvantageous outcome for the majority group (white officers)? Since, in the pretest results, it was found that whites already felt that blacks were receiving special treatment within the department (in contrast to the blacks' feeling that it was whites who received preferential treatment), here again was additional proof of the preferred status of blacks. This would explain why the rise seemed equally as prominent among experimentals as among controls drawn from the same class. Thus, not only were departmental authority figures acknowledging the presence of a problem between blacks and whites but they were even initiating a special program whose purpose was to give further preferential treatment to blacks.

Granted, both the pretest instructions and the structured interviews given to group members to explain the program had been formulated in such a way as to present it in a positive fashion to all officers. Thus great emphasis was placed on the fact that the group sessions and role playing would help the participants to become more skilled in dealing with the complex problems in human relationships which confront the police today. However, there is no question but that many of the men perceived the program as being for the benefit of blacks rather than whites and some interviews which were held with group members following graduation from

the academy revealed that some men did not really know that the program was voluntary. It was also clear that many officers were afraid that their refusal to cooperate might be held against them. Thus it seems safe to assume that in some cases the program may not have been perceived as something initiated for the benefit of the majority group (whites).

This would, in turn, help to explain the very positive reactions which the groups produced among black participants. Not only did they show evidence of being more concerned about racial issues in terms of an increased sensitivity regarding equality, but in addition to this they felt that relationships between black and white officers were even better than they had been at the beginning of their academy training. Blacks who did not participate in the groups, on the other hand, became even more disillusioned over black-white relationships. Again, as with Kephart's (1957) study, one sees that a strong relationship exists between perceiving an improvement in black-white problems and having positive feelings towards members of the "other group." Thus group members expressed more positive feelings about whites, than their controls, which is in sharp contrast to whites whose increase in negative feelings was accompanied by a corresponding perception of greater black-white friction within the department.

It is also interesting to note that while there was a negative impact among whites which seemed to reverberate throughout the entire class in which groups were conducted, no such reaction of a positive nature took place among blacks. Instead, only those black officers who actually participated in the program showed positive changes. Group participants appeared to feel more integrated into the majority group and more accepted by their white peers and their expressions of positive feelings about

whites seemed to become more similar to their expressed feelings about blacks. In contrast to this their controls showed even greater divergence than before in terms of their feelings concerning blacks versus whites, became even more negative about the latter and more positive about the former.

A further possible confounding variable, in this study, which is discussed by Sapir (1951) and Williams (1964) involves the intensity and direction of initial attitudes towards a particular minority group. Initially positive attitudes tend to become more positive when contacts between groups increase, while initially negative attitudes tend to become more negative. This is especially true when the *intensity* of these initial attitudes is great for the highly prejudiced person, who usually attempts to avoid contact with members of a target group and who will become even more negative when confronted with an unavoidable increase in contact (Taylor, cited in Cook, 1963, p. 46, and Sapir, 1951). However, an examination of the pretest scores of white officers in the present study did not reveal any trends which would indicate that only the highly prejudiced became more negative at post-testing. Instead, there seemed to be no predictability as to how a subject would shift in terms of initial prejudice level and indeed, as mentioned, most subjects shifted in a negative direction if they were in police classes where the experimental program was carried on. Although one might argue that the initial mean level was high for all subjects there was still a considerable range of scores represented at pretesting with individuals falling at both extremes of the continuum. All in all, then, level of intensity did not seem to have been a crucial variable in determining the direction or extent of shift in prejudice as a result of either the group sessions or the experimental program.

One question which still cannot be answered is whether the group sessions would have produced more positive changes among white participants if they had been continued for a greater length of time. This clearly is an empirical question and an attempt was made to answer it in the second phase of this research which follows shortly. Also, would the results have been different if the entire structuring of the program had been changed so that there was no mention ever made of black-white problems? Again Phase Two was structured to deal with this. Clearly, one implication that does arise is that one must be very careful to structure a program so that all participants feel that it has been initiated for their benefit alone, rather than for the benefit of someone else or some other group. Although, as has been mentioned, an attempt was made to do this, apparently it may not have been done carefully enough. For example, quite possibly no mention of racial problems should even have been made as one of the purposes behind the project. Instead the entire focus should have been on the improvement of interpersonal skills alone, with the only goal being an attempt to enhance the effectiveness of the police officer in his work.

There is, of course, no doubt that regardless of the structuring which is done prior to a program, individual participants are inevitably going to search for their own explanations. This was clearly illustrated when the principal investigator interviewed veteran patrolmen during Phase Two with the intent of forming groups at the precinct level. One white officer immediately identified the purpose of the program as an attempt on the part of the police hierarchy to "integrate the scout cars." Farber (1963) clearly illustrated this point in his investigation of college students who were used as subjects in an experiment whose purpose

was supposedly kept secret from them. He concluded that regardless of what the investigator may think he has communicated regarding the purpose of his research project, one of the most important factors in determining his results are "the things that people say to themselves." Their explanations as to what is happening may be quite at variance with what the experimenter expects or desires but one can be sure that these explanations will play an important role in just how they respond.

CHAPTER II

PHASE 2: GROUP EXPERIENCE

It was originally intended that the second phase of the study would be initiated as soon as Class IV had graduated from the academy. During this period, group experience would be introduced to men who were now involved in regular police duty with the idea that one could then gauge the effectiveness of this program with officers who were facing the ongoing problems of street duty. It was felt that perhaps the relative insularity of academy life might not be the most appropriate time for this kind of small group experience since the men were often dealing with anticipated problems and situations and the reality of black-white issues within the department was still muted. In addition, officers on duty would bring fresh material from their daily experiences as patrolmen into the group which might further increase the affective nature of group interactions.

The plan was to include in each of the new groups both former experimentals from the academy and former controls who had no previous group experience. In addition, veteran officers with at least three years of experience would also be included since it was felt that their greater wealth of police experience might also serve as a catalyst. The investigator was also interested in whether these men with greater experience would differ attitudinally from the rookies as well as whether they would be as amenable to change. The use of former experimentals would, of course, supply evidence concerning whether more extensive group experience

was necessary for change (36 hours versus 18 hours), an issue that has already been raised in the discussion of Phase I.

Phase 2, however, had to be immediately postponed, and it was not until almost an entire year had elapsed before it could be put into effect. The first stumbling block which presented itself was the fact that it was almost impossible to recruit volunteers to participate in the program once they had graduated from the academy. The offer of time-and-a-half overtime pay for after-duty group involvement was insufficient and the men no longer felt under the pressure of academy discipline. When it became clear that it would be impossible to select an unbiased sample, the possibility of a volunteer program was abandoned. By this time the results of Phase I had also been analyzed along with the realization that the program would have to be restructured in some way in order to avoid the backlash effect which was so apparent among white officers.

Fortunately the Commissioner and other police officials were both aware of, and concerned by, what they felt to be increasing racial conflict between black and white officers. It was therefore decided to begin a further training program which would be structured to the men as something initiated by the department itself, and that all racial implications would be underplayed. This did not mean that racial problems would not be dealt with as they arose in groups, but only that the structuring would emphasize sensitivity to people and would stress the general importance of interpersonal skills. The training sessions would thus be introduced as a program for handling all kinds of citizen-police situations where some tact, and an awareness of how the other person might feel, could avoid escalating a small problem into a major confrontation. Thus initial sessions dealt with listening skills, trying to learn how to adopt another's point

of view, creating awareness of how one's perception is affected by one's needs, etc. Since all groups were again bi-racial in composition, the leader could then leave it to group members to introduce racial issues and these could then be dealt with as other examples of critical incidents.

Because of the problems of changing shifts among patrolmen it was also difficult to maintain the former schedule of eighteen hours over twelve sessions. Instead it was decided that groups would meet on a weekly basis for six, three hour sessions. Group leaders actually felt these more concentrated time periods would allow for greater involvement since it often took thirty or forty minutes for a group to "warm-up." Since men were ordered to attend the training sessions as part of their duty, the problem of a possible biased sample was avoided. All men were chosen randomly (with the exception that an attempt was made to limit the veteran group to officers with about three to five years of experience) and between three and four groups were conducted each week by two group leaders. Thus the entire training period involved in Phase 2 was approximately twenty weeks for ten groups.

Procedure

Structuring of the Groups:

Each group member received a letter, signed by the commissioner, informing him that he had been selected for a new training program developed by the department whose purpose was to increase the effectiveness of the patrolman. This letter is reproduced in the appendix.

As mentioned, random selection was made from former experimentals, former controls and C-controls, and from a pool of veteran officers with approximately five years of experience. All new controls were selected

In the same fashion although more names than necessary were chosen for most categories in order to increase the total sample. This was because of the investigator's wish to also study other variables such as the amount of change in attitudes and values since graduation from the academy and the effect of various precinct assignments on these same attitudinal variables.

Post-testing:

Because of the fact that a problem in terms of a biased sample would also be faced if voluntary participation for post-testing was allowed, this too was made mandatory. Men were post-tested in small groups during duty hours, and, with only a few exceptions, all men who were randomly selected were evaluated one month after the last groups had terminated. Tests used were identical to those which had been administered in Phase I of the program. The letter introducing post-testing to all new experimentals and controls with the commissioner's signature can also be found in the appendix.

The investigator, who conducted all post-testing, also discussed the purpose of the evaluation. As with those explanations given to men in the academy during Phase I, emphasis was placed on the fact that in no case would reports on individual men go to the department. It was pointed out that the only interest of the department was in the effectiveness of certain programs, and a wish to study changes that had taken place in selected classes which had graduated from the academy almost eighteen months previously. As a final point of reassurance regarding the anonymity of results the investigator pointed out that if the department really wished to obtain test results from anyone they would simply order men to report, as had been done with one special unit a short time ago, and there was no real need for subterfuge. In only one case did a man refuse to cooperate

after this explanation and no attempt was made to press the issue with him.

Subjects:

The following group compositions were originally planned for Phase 2.

Six groups composed of:

3 former white experimentals
3 former white controls
1 former black experimental
1 former black control
1 black veteran officer
1 white veteran officer

Four groups composed of:

3 former white C-controls
4 white veteran officers
3 black veteran officers

Thus it was anticipated that 70 white officers and 30 black officers would be broken down into a total of ten groups, each being seen on a weekly basis for three hours over a six week period. However, because of some minor attrition due to men being suspended and leaving the force, or because of a shortage of former black controls or, in a few cases, because of an inability to obtain post-test data, the final sample obtained with complete post-testing results was as follows.

31 former white experimentals	- in Phase 2, 18 were experimentals and 13 controls
35 former white controls	- in Phase 2, 10 were experimentals and 25 were controls
33 former white C-controls	- in Phase 2, 14 were experimentals and 19 controls
15 former black experimentals	- in Phase 2, 3 were experimentals and 12 controls
10 former black controls	- in Phase 2, 4 were experimentals and 6 were controls
2 former black C-controls	- in Phase 2, 2 were experimentals

- 44 white veteran officers - in Phase 2, 19 were experimentals and 25 controls
- 34 black veteran officers - in Phase 2, 12 were experimentals and 22 controls

Thus the total group which was available for analysis in terms of having complete post-test data was 82 experimentals (61 whites and 21 blacks) and 122 controls (82 whites and 40 blacks). The loss of 18 men from the originally anticipated experimental sample of 100 men included officers who were dropped or suspended from the force while the program was ongoing, those who were disabled or ill during post-testing, and, in only a few cases, those who did not show up for the testing in spite of receiving a direct order from the commissioner and precinct commanders.

Group Leaders:

While there had been only one group leader during Phase 1, it was impossible for one man to handle all groups in Phase 2. Most groups (six) were handled by the same white group leader who saw the men in the academy but four of the groups in the second phase were led by two different black leaders, each of whom carried two groups during this second phase of the program. The effect of the group leader thus became a variable which had to be studied during the analysis especially since the race of the leader was varied with four of the ten groups.

Analysis of Data:

In order to evaluate the changes which had taken place in men since they had graduated from the academy, a repeated (three) measures analysis of variance program was used in which changes in test data could be studied from initial entrance into the academy, to graduation, and then

up until the final testing 18 months later. This report is contained in Chapter III.

However, repeated measures could not be used to study the impact of the group experience because a major portion of the new experimentals had not been tested prior to treatment--namely, the veteran officer group. Thus an analysis was made to determine whether any differences were present, on final post-testing, between the pretested and non-pretested officers. In order to avoid confounding these with previous or present treatment effects, former white C-controls, who remained part of the present control group, were compared with a sample of white veteran controls. These results may be found in the appendix. No differences appeared on any of the measures which might have been expected to change as a result of training. Thus the two groups of men were similar on attitude measures dealing with black-white perceptions and on values like "equality" on the Rokeach scales. As a result of treatment effects were examined by using post-test scores only, again using an analysis of variance program of unweighted means to deal with where cell size frequency was uneven.

Results

Overall Treatment Effects for Whites:

Analyses of variance were done for white officers considering former status as an independent variable. Because no differences emerged between men who had previous group training and those who did not (see appendix for these analyses), all white experimentals were pooled together and compared with controls who received no treatment. The fact that no differences

were found is not surprising in that more than one year had elapsed between training programs.

As can be seen from Table XIII, few Terminal Values differentiated experimentals from controls at the level required for statistical significance. White experimentals were found to rate both "pleasure" and "true friendship" as more important than their controls ($F=3.97$, $p=.05$; and $F=5.20$, $p=.05$ respectively). There were no differences on "equality," however, which was the one value which might have been expected to change most if shifts in attitudes towards race had taken place (equality correlated $+0.41$ with the California E (Negro) scale in Phase I data). Neither are there many similarities between these results and those obtained during Phase I (see Table VII, Chapter I). Although experimentals in Phase I did show an increased interest in "pleasure" and "true friendship" similar to the present findings, their shift at that time did not reach the level required for statistical significance. In addition these changes are not entirely in a direction that would indicate increased empathy towards minority groups since one represents a shift towards greater hedonism. Thus these results cannot be considered indicative of any positive changes among experimentals in terms of greater social awareness and sensitivity towards others.

An examination of Instrumental Values in Table XIV failed to show any differences between experimentals and controls. There is a slight tendency for experimentals to rate "polite" as more important, which might be indicative of a positive interpersonal change, but the obtained F of 3.23 failed to reach the level required for statistical significance. All in all, therefore, there is again little evidence that the program accomplished the desired end during Phase 2 nor did it replicate any of the findings of Phase I (see Table VIII, Chapter I).

TABLE XIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON TERMINAL VALUES

		Means	F ratios
A comfortable life	Experimental	8.26	.00
	N = 61		
	Control	8.25	
	N = 82		
An exciting life	Experimental	9.90	1.40
	Control	8.84	
A sense of accomplishment	Experimental	6.64	.67
	Control	6.05	
A world at peace	Experimental	10.41	3.10
	Control	8.79	
A world of beauty	Experimental	14.02	.03
	Control	14.12	
Equality	Experimental	12.49	.00
	Control	12.50	
Family security	Experimental	4.00	.43
	Control	4.40	
Freedom	Experimental	6.06	.18
	Control	5.97	
Happiness	Experimental	7.31	.42
	Control	7.77	
Inner harmony	Experimental	10.00	.02
	Control	9.91	

TABLE XIII (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
Mature love	Experimental	9.54	.06
	Control	9.35	
National security	Experimental	11.34	.73
	Control	10.62	
Pleasure	Experimental	10.85	3.97*
	Control	12.15	
Salvation	Experimental	13.82	.18
	Control	13.46	
Self-respect	Experimental	6.29	.63
	Control	6.85	
Social recognition	Experimental	12.24	.93
	Control	12.98	
True friendship	Experimental	9.62	5.20*
	Control	11.15	
Wisdom	Experimental	8.16	.24
	Control	7.80	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XIV
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

		Means	F ratios
Ambitious	Experimental N = 61	6.24	.03
	Control N = 82	6.38	
Broadminded	Experimental	8.62	.54
	Control	8.05	
Capable	Experimental	7.28	.26
	Control	7.68	
Cheerful	Experimental	12.34	.52
	Control	12.93	
Clean	Experimental	9.16	.65
	Control	9.80	
Courageous	Experimental	9.00	.49
	Control	8.44	
Forgiving	Experimental	13.54	.75
	Control	12.89	
Helpful	Experimental	11.01	.09
	Control	10.77	
Honest	Experimental	4.13	.12
	Control	3.90	
Imaginative	Experimental	12.85	.90
	Control	12.18	
Independent	Experimental	10.01	.23
	Control	9.58	

TABLE XIV (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
Intellectual	Experimental	9.85	.42
	Control	10.40	
Logical	Experimental	9.11	.08
	Control	8.90	
Loving	Experimental	11.67	.31
	Control	11.23	
Obedient	Experimental	12.38	.14
	Control	12.08	
Polite	Experimental	10.46	3.23
	Control	11.82	
Responsible	Experimental	6.06	.11
	Control	6.30	
Self-controlled	Experimental	7.36	.16
	Control	7.68	

Finally, an examination of Table XV for changes on the California Scales and other questionnaire items show only one result that could be considered positive. Experimentals express greater positive feelings towards blacks than their controls (Variable 4) and the F of 4.78 is significant at the .05 level. Experimentals also feel that there is not a strong desire on the part of police to understand blacks (Variable 11, $F=4.26$, $p=.05$) which could be interpreted as showing greater empathy for the black position. However, there were none of the expected changes on the California E (Negro) scale. This would suggest that the positive feelings expressed by experimental whites on Variable 4 should be considered with some skepticism. Thus these experimentals may be giving some "lip service" to liking blacks which fails, however, to carry over to more subtle measures such as "equality" on the Rokeach Scale and the California E Scale towards Negroes.

One question that might arise is whether white officers who were seen in groups led by a black leader might differ from those seen by a white leader. An analysis was therefore done separately for whites by race of leader and these results are contained in Tables XVI, XVII and XVIII. Essentially these results are identical to those obtained by grouping all white officers together with, however, a few exceptions. White officers who were seen by black leaders rated "social recognition" as significantly more important than their controls ($F=3.95$, $p=.05$). Results obtained with a white leader on this value were actually in the opposite direction. In addition, "mature love" was rated as significantly less important by black-led white experimentals ($F=4.45$, $p=.05$) and again this is opposite to that found among their white leader counterparts.

TABLE XV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON THE CALIFORNIA F AND E
SCALES AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

		Means	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:			
F Scale	Experimentals	85.44	.09
	Controls	86.34	
Ethnocentrism Negroes	Experimentals	27.00	.50
	Controls	28.16	
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	Experimentals	18.93	.02
	Controls	19.06	
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	Experimentals	8.23	.18
	Controls	8.39	
2. Rating of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	Experimentals	5.23	.99
	Controls	4.98	
3. Ratings of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	Experimentals	6.95	1.14
	Controls	7.34	
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	Experimentals	5.29	4.78*
	Controls	5.82	
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	Experimentals	4.43	.24
	Controls	4.32	
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	Experimentals	6.21	.15
	Controls	6.12	

TABLE XV (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	Experimentals	9.49	.02
	Controls	9.52	
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	Experimentals	4.61	.00
	Controls	4.60	
9. Amount of black contact (17)	Experimentals	7.77	.24
	Controls	7.27	
10. Amount of white contact (item 18)	Experimentals	10.57	1.51
	Controls	11.18	
11. Police want to understand blacks (item 20)	Experimentals	3.10	4.26*
	Controls	2.72	
12. Police guilty of abuse (item 21)	Experimentals	2.16	.03
	Controls	2.19	
13. Blacks laugh at police (item 22)	Experimentals	1.69	.33
	Controls	1.78	
14. Blacks are most criminal (items 23, 30)	Experimentals	5.90	2.66
	Controls	6.48	
15. Poverty and crime caused (items 24, 25)	Experimentals	4.98	.01
	Controls	4.95	
16. Community controlled police (item 26) important	Experimentals	4.36	.63
	Controls	4.21	
17. Separate police-community relations (item 27)	Experimentals	3.87	2.73
	Controls	3.55	
18. Blacks assumed guilty (item 28)	Experimentals	2.97	.31
	Controls	2.85	

TABLE XV (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
19. Police-community relations important (item 29)	Experimentals	2.08	.13
	Controls	2.01	
20. Name-calling by police bad (item 31)	Experimentals	1.80	.16
	Controls	1.87	
21. Blacks want more police (item 32)	Experimentals	2.16	1.41
	Controls	1.94	
22. Blacks work hard (item 33)	Experimentals	2.97	.27
	Controls	3.07	
23. Two separate police unions is best (item 34)	Experimentals	4.20	.36
	Controls	4.32	
24. Police brutality exaggerated (item 35)	Experimentals	1.64	.58
	Controls	1.54	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR
WHITE OFFICERS BY WHITE AND BLACK GROUP
LEADERS ON TERMINAL VALUES

		White Leader N = 35		Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
A comfortable life	Experimental	8.09	.03	8.50	.04
	Controls (N=82)	8.26		8.26	
An exciting life	Experimental	9.46	.31	10.50	2.08
	Controls	8.84		8.84	
A sense of accomplishment	Experimental	7.23	2.03	5.84	.04
	Controls	6.05		6.05	
A world at peace	Experimental	10.11	1.43	10.81	2.68
	Controls	8.79		8.79	
A world of beauty	Experimental	14.31	.08	13.61	.43
	Controls	14.12		14.12	
Equality	Experimental	12.83	.12	12.03	.18
	Controls	12.50		12.50	
Family security	Experimental	3.24	2.71	4.95	.44
	Controls	4.40		4.40	
Freedom	Experimental	5.97	.00	6.19	.06
	Controls	5.98		5.98	
Happiness	Experimental	6.94	.92	7.81	.00
	Controls	7.76		7.77	

TABLE XVI (continued)

		White Leader N = 35		Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Inner harmony	Experimental	9.49	.22	10.77	.71
	Control	9.91		9.91	
Mature love	Experimental	8.20	1.84	11.85	4.46*
	Control	9.35		9.35	
National security	Experimental	12.54	3.66	9.73	.63
	Control	10.62		10.62	
Pleasure	Experimental	11.02	2.11	10.61	3.23
	Control	12.15		12.15	
Salvation	Experimental	13.51	.00	14.23	.48
	Control	13.46		13.46	
Self-respect	Experimental	7.00	.03	5.35	2.75
	Control	6.85		6.85	
Social recognition	Experimental	13.20	.07	10.96	3.95*
	Control	12.98		12.98	
True friendship	Experimental	9.57	3.95*	9.69	2.59
	Control	11.16		11.16	
Wisdom	Experimental	8.26	.28	8.04	.05
	Control	7.80		7.80	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XVII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR
 WHITE OFFICERS BY WHITE AND BLACK GROUP
 LEADERS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

		White Leader N=35		Black Leader N=26	
		Mean	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Ambitious	Experimental	6.20	.04	6.31	.00
	Control (N=82)	6.38		6.38	
Broadminded	Experimental	8.09	.00	8.35	1.45
	Control	8.05		8.05	
Capable	Experimental	7.80	.01	6.58	1.13
	Control	7.68		7.68	
Cheerful	Experimental	11.31	2.73	13.73	.58
	Control	12.93		12.93	
Clean	Experimental	8.60	1.58	9.92	.01
	Control	9.80		9.80	
Courageous	Experimental	8.97	.33	9.04	.32
	Control	8.44		8.44	
Forgiving	Experimental	12.80	.01	14.54	2.91
	Control	12.89		12.89	
Helpful	Experimental	11.34	.37	10.58	.03
	Control	10.77		10.77	
Honest	Experimental	4.77	1.08	3.27	.63
	Control	3.90		3.90	

TABLE XVII (Continued)

		White Leader N=35		Black Leader N=26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Imaginative	Experimental	13.77	3.71	11.61	.38
	Control	12.18		12.18	
Independent	Experimental	9.40	.03	10.84	1.18
	Control	9.58		9.58	
Intellectual	Experimental	10.08	.10	9.54	.57
	Control	10.40		10.40	
Logical	Experimental	9.31	.23	8.85	.00
	Control	8.90		8.90	
Loving	Experimental	10.83	.17	12.81	2.31
	Control	11.23		11.23	
Obedient	Experimental	13.20	1.48	11.27	.59
	Control	12.08		12.08	
Polite	Experimental	10.94	.96	9.81	4.19*
	Control	11.82		11.82	
Responsible	Experimental	5.68	.55	6.58	.08
	Control	6.30		6.30	
Self-controlled	Experimental	8.03	.13	6.46	1.36
	Control	7.68		7.68	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR WHITE OFFICERS BY WHITE AND BLACK LEADERS ON
THE CALIFORNIA F AND E SCALES AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

		White Leader N = 35		Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:					
F Scale	Experimental	81.06	2.25	91.35	1.80
	Control (N=82)	86.34		86.34	
Ethnocentrism Negroes	Experimental	25.97	1.21	28.38	.01
	Control	28.16		28.16	
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	Experimental	16.91	3.60	21.65	4.31*
	Control	19.06		19.06	
Attitude Questionnaire:					
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	Experimental	8.40	.00	8.00	.60
	Control	8.39		8.39	
2. Rating of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	Experimental	5.34	1.37	5.08	.10
	Control	4.98		4.98	

TABLE XVIII (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 35	Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	F ratios
3. Rating of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	Experimental	7.20	.10	2.23
	Control	7.34		
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	Experimental	5.40	2.13	3.97*
	Control	5.82		
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	Experimental	4.46	.26	.05
	Control	4.32		
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	Experimental	6.29	.33	.00
	Control	6.12		
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	Experimental	9.34	.30	.21
	Control	9.52		
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	Experimental	4.54	.02	.05
	Control	4.60		
9. Amount of black contact (item 17)	Experimental	7.11	.11	.22
	Control	7.27		

TABLE XVIII (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 35		Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
10. Amount of white contact (item 18)	Experimental	10.60	1.17	10.54	.90
	Control	11.18		11.18	
11. Police want to understand blacks (item 20)	Experimental	3.09	2.64	3.11	3.00
	Control	2.72		2.72	
12. Police guilty of abuse (item 21)	Experimental	2.23	.02	2.08	.26
	Control	2.20		2.20	
13. Blacks laugh at police (item 22)	Experimental	1.63	.68	1.77	.00
	Control	1.78		1.78	
14. Blacks are most criminal (items 23, 30)	Experimental	6.00	1.35	5.77	2.37
	Control	6.48		6.48	
15. Poverty and crime caused (items 24, 25)	Experimental	5.00	.02	4.96	.00
	Control	4.95		4.95	
16. Community controlled police important (item 26)	Experimental	4.49	1.49	4.19	.00
	Control	4.21		4.20	
17. Separate police-community relations (item 27)	Experimental	3.86	1.71	3.88	1.80
	Control	3.55		3.55	

TABLE XVIII (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 35		Black Leader N = 26	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
18. Blacks assumed guilty (item 28)	Experimental	3.06	.71	2.84	.00
	Control	2.85		2.85	
19. Police-community relations important (item 29)	Experimental	2.14	.34	2.00	.00
	Control	2.01		2.01	
20. Name calling by police bad (item 31)	Experimental	1.69	.98	1.96	.21
	Control	1.86		1.86	
21. Blacks want more police (item 32)	Experimental	2.03	.16	2.35	2.66
	Control	1.94		1.94	
22. Blacks work hard (item 33)	Experimental	2.91	.40	3.04	.01
	Control	3.07		3.07	
23. Two separate police unions best (item 34)	Experimental	4.14	.50	4.27	.03
	Control	4.32		4.32	
24. Police brutality exaggerated	Experimental	1.51	.02	1.81	2.18
	Control	1.54		1.54	

On Instrumental Values one new difference appeared. White officers with a black leader rated "polite" as significantly more important than did their controls ($F=4.19$, $p=.05$). However, there was an identical trend in this direction when the leader of the group was white even though this did not reach the level required for statistical significance.

The only difference that appeared on the other questionnaire items involved ethnocentrism towards foreigners. If white officers had a black group leader they were found to have significantly greater ethnocentrism towards foreigners than their controls ($F=4.31$, $p=.05$). The opposite was true if they had a white leader although this result just failed to reach the level required for statistical significance ($F=3.60$, $p=.10$). Other trends in this same direction concerned the tendency for white officers led by a black to become higher on authoritarianism ($F=1.80$, n.s.) while those led by a white were lower than their controls on this same scale ($F=2.25$, n.s.). Thus there is some evidence of a shift in a rather negative direction in the attitudes of white officers seen by a black leader. This is, of course, somewhat contradicted by the fact that these same whites are still significantly different than their controls on Variable 4 where they again give "lip-service" to liking blacks more than their controls ($F=3.97$, $p=.05$).

In summary then, it is difficult to see clear cut evidence of positive shifts in attitudes among white officers who were involved in the training program. Certainly there is at least no evidence of the backlash effect noted in Phase I where experimentals expressed greater awareness of black-white problems but became more prejudiced as well on many measures. It can also be noted that when white experimentals are examined in terms of whether the group leader was white or black, the results are in the

same direction with a few exceptions. Thus all white experimentals show greater interest in pleasure and true friendship. However, those seen by a black leader also show more concern for social recognition (respect and admiration) and politeness. Sexual and spiritual intimacy (mature love) also become less important to these men. In addition, they become more prejudiced towards foreigners. This, together with other trends among these experimentals might indicate that having a black leader may lead to some backlash or polarization. This result is, however, apparently contradicted by the finding that all whites, regardless of their leader, profess more positive feelings for blacks. All in all, then, the results certainly do not show the backlash effect seen in Phase I. However, neither can they be thought of as strongly supporting the presence of positive effects stemming from the training program.

Overall Treatment Effects for Blacks:

Since the most positive results obtained in Phase I appeared for black officers who participated in groups, the overall treatment effects for blacks were examined and these are presented in Tables XIX, XX and XXI. Table XIX, which contains the results for Terminal Values reveals that black experimentals rated "self-respect" as less important ($F=4.55$, $p=.05$) and "wisdom" as more important ($F=4.72$, $p=.05$) than their controls following the group program. Reference back to Table X in Chapter I shows that these results bear little similarity to those found in Phase I where black experimentals showed their greatest change by placing more importance on "equality" than their controls. Although black experimentals at that time, had also shifted "self-respect" to a position of less importance, similar to the present finding, that shift was non-significant.

TABLE XIX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON TERMINAL VALUES

		Means	F ratios
A comfortable life	Experimental N = 21	8.38	1.51
	Control N = 40	6.92	
An exciting life	Experimental	10.81	.31
	Control	11.52	
A sense of accomplishment	Experimental	8.33	3.61
	Control	6.40	
A world at peace	Experimental	8.76	.91
	Control	10.17	
A world of beauty	Experimental	14.00	.23
	Control	14.45	
Equality	Experimental	6.33	1.40
	Control	4.97	
Family security	Experimental	5.43	.45
	Control	4.72	
Freedom	Experimental	5.90	.64
	Control	5.00	
Happiness	Experimental	6.62	.61
	Control	7.45	
Inner harmony	Experimental	8.76	2.19
	Control	10.35	

TABLE XIX (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
Mature love	Experimental	10.00	1.11
	Control	11.22	
National security	Experimental	13.14	.17
	Control	13.67	
Pleasure	Experimental	12.00	.52
	Control	12.72	
Salvation	Experimental	14.81	1.69
	Control	12.98	
Self-respect	Experimental	7.57	4.55*
	Control	5.77	
Social recognition	Experimental	12.14	.00
	Control	12.20	
True friendship	Experimental	12.38	.08
	Control	12.10	
Wisdom	Experimental	5.76	4.72*
	Control	8.10	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

		Means	F ratios
Ambitious	Experimental N = 21	7.23	.98
	Control N = 40	6.22	
Broadminded	Experimental	7.05	.09
	Control	7.40	
Capable	Experimental	7.95	.62
	Control	8.95	
Cheerful	Experimental	13.29	.00
	Control	13.22	
Clean	Experimental	10.09	.68
	Control	8.97	
Courageous	Experimental	9.76	2.69
	Control	7.87	
Forgiving	Experimental	14.48	12.07**
	Control	10.48	
Helpful	Experimental	11.00	1.12
	Control	9.82	
Honest	Experimental	4.71	.04
	Control	4.50	
Imaginative	Experimental	10.09	20.40**
	Control	14.32	

TABLE XX (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
Independent	Experimental	9.05	.48
	Control	8.10	
Intellectual	Experimental	6.52	6.03*
	Control	9.75	
Logical	Experimental	8.29	8.19**
	Control	11.62	
Loving	Experimental	13.00	.03
	Control	13.22	
Obedient	Experimental	13.81	.10
	Control	13.42	
Polite	Experimental	11.43	.08
	Control	11.05	
Responsible	Experimental	6.43	.62
	Control	5.52	
Self-controlled	Experimental	6.81	.06
	Control	6.52	

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

TABLE XXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF OVERALL TREATMENT EFFECTS
FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON THE CALIFORNIA F AND E
SCALES AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Social Survey Questions:		Means	F ratios
F Scale	Experimental N = 21	76.86	.16
	Control N = 40	78.95	
Ethnocentrism Negroes	Experimental	13.62	.94
	Control	12.58	
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	Experimental	14.90	.14
	Control	15.48	
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	Experimental	8.67	.00
	Control	8.70	
2. Rating of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	Experimental	4.99	.00
	Control	5.00	
3. Rating of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	Experimental	8.62	.00
	Control	8.60	
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	Experimental	3.29	1.58
	Control	2.85	
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	Experimental	5.24	1.22
	Control	4.77	
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	Experimental	10.52	1.04
	Control	9.97	

TABLE XXI (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	Experimental	5.38	.07
	Control	5.50	
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	Experimental	3.19	8.63**
	Control	2.38	
9. Amount of black contact (item 17)	Experimental	11.14	1.35
	Control	12.05	
10. Amount of white contact (item 18)	Experimental	7.62	3.54
	Control	9.38	
11. Police want to understand blacks (item 20)	Experimental	2.67	.51
	Control	2.40	
12. Police guilty of abuse (item 21)	Experimental	1.19	.23
	Control	1.28	
13. Blacks laugh at police (item 22)	Experimental	2.14	.49
	Control	2.38	
14. Blacks are most criminal (items 23, 30)	Experimental	5.48	1.33
	Control	6.18	
15. Poverty and crime caused (items 24, 25)	Experimental	5.43	3.72
	Control	4.38	
16. Community controlled police important (item 26)	Experimental	3.52	1.27
	Control	3.90	
17. Separate police-community relations (item 27)	Experimental	3.33	.01
	Control	3.30	
18. Blacks assumed guilty (item 28)	Experimental	2.09	.65
	Control	1.88	

TABLE XXI (CONTINUED)

		Means	F ratios
19. Police-community relations important (item 29)	Experimental	1.48	.20
	Control	1.38	
20. Name calling by police bad (item 31)	Experimental	1.57	2.78
	Control	1.30	
21. Blacks want more police (item 32)	Experimental	1.48	.85
	Control	1.30	
22. Blacks work hard (item 33)	Experimental	1.81	3.91
	Control	1.40	
23. Two separate police unions is best (item 34)	Experimental	3.90	.00
	Control	3.90	
24. Police brutality exaggerated (item 35)	Experimental	2.52	.69
	Control	2.22	

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

They had also rated "wisdom" as less important, following Phase I, which is contrary to the present finding. Thus there seems to be little evidence on terminal values that black experimentals shifted in the predicted direction nor did they change in a fashion similar to Phase I.

On Instrumental Values in Table XX, many more significant differences between experimentals and controls appear. Here experimentals rated "forgiving" as less important ($F=12.07$, $p=.01$) while "imaginative," "intellectual" and "logical" were all placed in a position of greater importance in their lives, as compared to controls ($F=20.40$, $p=.01$; $F=6.03$, $p=.05$ and $F=8.19$, $p=.01$, respectively). Thus experimentals appear to have become more interested in cognitive values following the group experience while, in some ways, they show a corresponding decrease in emphasis on the softer, affective values. This is suggested not only by the shift on "forgiving" but also by their decreased interest in "helpful," although the latter change represents only a non-significant trend. Again, however, this is contrary to the findings of Phase I where experimentals placed greater value on "forgiveness" ($F=3.76$, $p=.05 - .10$) and less emphasis on cognitive values such as "intellectual" ($F=9.11$, $p=.01$) and "logical" ($F=2.45$, $p=.15$). Thus the present shifts are contrary to those found previously and it is difficult to think of them as indicative of any greater sensitivity in interpersonal skills. What they do suggest is that the present black experimentals became more cognitive and introspective but without any apparent increase in terms of affective sensitivity. Change in this latter area, however, was considered to be one of the goals of the present program.

Table XXI shows the differences found on the other scales and questionnaire items. While previous results had shown that black experimentals

became more positive about their relationships to both white officers and whites in general, no such finding appeared in the present analysis.

Indeed, no significant differences appeared on any items with the one exception of their evaluation of blacks as professional officers. Here they seem, at first glance, to report more negative feelings about black officers than their controls on Variable 8 (items 16 and 19 on the questionnaire) and the F of 8.63 is significant at the .01 level. However, this finding is difficult to interpret at face value because one of the contributing items to this score deals with attitudes towards integrated scout cars. When this variable was analyzed for whites, a high score had a definite negative connotation towards blacks. However, it cannot be interpreted in this fashion when blacks demand segregated scout cars since this reflects more hostile feelings towards whites. Thus one would most likely conclude that the significant shift on this variable represents increased negativism towards whites on the part of black experimentals and greater militancy on their part when compared to controls. This, of course, would be entirely contrary to the findings of Phase I.

Some additional support for this conjecture can be gained by examining other items dealing with negative feelings towards whites. Although none of the other differences are statistically significant, black experimentals, in comparison to controls, report more negative feelings towards whites on Variable 7, (contrary to the significantly more positive feelings in Phase I on this item), they have stronger feelings that blacks receive poorer assignments (Variable 6) and they report less contact with whites (Variable 10). These admittedly are only trends but one can conclude that there is no evidence to support the existence of less polarized attitudes, among black experimentals, as had been found following the academy group program.

Again, in order to determine whether there were differential effects for black officers depending upon the race of the group leader, a separate analysis was done for black officers on this basis. These results can be found in Tables XXII, XXIII and XXIV. As with the whites, the results seem rather consistent with those found when all blacks were grouped together. Again, however, there were some exceptions. One of the most glaring of these is in Table XXII for the value "equality." Black officers who were seen by a black leader rate "equality" as significantly less important than their controls ($F=5.98, p=.05$). This is in an entirely opposite direction to the results obtained from blacks who were led by a white group leader. In addition, blacks with a black leader rated "pleasure" as significantly more important than controls ($F=4.53, p=.05$) which is again opposite to blacks with a white leader.

On Instrumental Values the results are identical for both groups of blacks regardless of the leader (see Table XXIII) and thus adds no further information to that found when all blacks were combined together. However, when the data on the other attitude measures and questionnaire items is examined (see Table XXIV), new significant results appear. Blacks who were seen by a black leader disagree more than controls that crime and poverty are due to environmental circumstances ($F=7.80, p=.01$), they do not feel as strongly as others that name calling by the police is bad ($F=4.94, p=.05$) and they even tend to feel that blacks do not work hard ($F=4.86, p=.05$). Thus they seem, in some ways, more negative towards other blacks than fellow black officers who had a white leader. Granted, however, the most obvious weakness of all this is the very small sample size involved (only nine subjects) and it may simply be that this is an accidentally biased sample of black officers. Certainly in view of this sample size it would

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR BLACK OFFICERS BY
WHITE AND BLACK GROUP LEADERS ON TERMINAL VALUES

		White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
A comfortable life	Experimental	9.17	2.29	7.33	.08
	Control (N=40)	6.92		6.92	
An exciting life	Experimental	11.92	.06	9.38	1.49
	Control	11.52		11.52	105
A sense of accomplishment	Experimental	8.75	3.86	7.78	.93
	Control	6.40		6.40	
A world at peace	Experimental	7.42	2.19	10.56	.04
	Control	10.17		10.18	
A world of beauty	Experimental	13.25	1.00	15.00	.21
	Control	14.45		14.45	
Equality	Experimental	4.50	.14	8.78	5.98*
	Control	4.97		4.98	

TABLE XXII (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Family security	Experimental	5.75	.72	5.00	.03
	Control	4.72		4.72	
Freedom	Experimental	6.50	1.09	5.11	.01
	Control	5.00		5.00	
Happiness	Experimental	7.00	.11	6.11	.80
	Control	7.45		7.45	
Inner harmony	Experimental	8.83	1.38	8.67	1.32
	Control	10.35		10.85	
Mature love	Experimental	9.42	1.81	10.78	.08
	Control	11.22		11.22	
National security	Experimental	14.33	.18	11.55	1.57
	Control	13.67		13.68	
Pleasure	Experimental	13.50	.48	10.00	4.53*
	Control	12.72		12.72	

TABLE XXII (CONTINUED)

	White Leader N = 12.		Black Leader N = 9	
	Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Salvation				
Experimental	13.42	.06	16.66	3.91
Control	12.97		12.97	
Self-respect				
Experimental	8.08	5.02*	6.89	.9
Control	5.77		5.78	
Social recognition				
Experimental	10.75	1.15	14.00	1.60
Control	12.20		12.20	
True friendship				
Experimental	12.08	.00	12.78	.23
Control	12.10		12.10	
Wisdom				
Experimental	6.33	1.88	5.00	4.90*
Control	8.10		8.10	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XXIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR BLACK OFFICER BY WHITE AND BLACK
GROUP LEADERS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

	White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9		
	Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios	
Ambitious	Experimental	7.75	1.45	6.56	.05
	Control (N=40)	6.22		6.22	
Broadminded	Experimental	7.08	.05	7.00	.06
	Control	7.40		7.40	.08
Capable	Experimental	8.83	.01	6.78	1.56
	Control	8.95		8.95	
Cheerful	Experimental	14.41	.84	11.78	.74
	Control	13.22		13.22	
Clean	Experimental	10.92	1.28	9.00	.00
	Control	8.97		8.97	
Courageous	Experimental	9.50	1.35	10.11	1.86
	Control	7.88		7.88	

TABLE XXIII (CONTINUED)

	White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9		
	Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios	
Forgiving	Experimental	14.00	5.59*	15.11	8.08**
	Control	10.48		10.48	
Helpful	Experimental	10.25	.09	12.00	2.14
	Control	9.82		9.82	
Honest	Experimental	3.25	1.16	6.67	2.52
	Control	4.40		4.50	
Imaginative	Experimental	10.67	10.37**	9.33	18.92**
	Control	14.32		14.32	
Independent	Experimental	9.42	.59	8.55	.07
	Control	8.10		8.10	
Intellectual	Experimental	6.58	3.67	6.44	3.30
	Control	9.75		9.75	
Logical	Experimental	8.17	5.83*	8.44	4.11*
	Control	11.52		11.62	

TABLE XXIII (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 12	Black Leader N = 9
		Means	F ratios
Loving	Experimental	12.50	.19
	Control	13.22	
Obedient	Experimental	13.42	.00
	Control	13.42	
Polite	Experimental	10.17	.28
	Control	11.05	
Responsible	Experimental	7.00	1.22
	Control	5.52	
Self-controlled	Experimental	7.08	.17
	Control	6.52	

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

TABLE XXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TREATMENT EFFECTS FOR BLACK OFFICERS BY WHITE AND BLACK
GROUP LEADERS ON THE CALIFORNIA F AND E SCALES AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

	White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
	Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:				
F scale	Experimental	.01	73.22	.54
	Control (N=40)		78.95	
Ethnocentrism Negroes	Experimental	.04	14.67	1.89
	Control		12.58	
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	Experimental	.07	14.78	.11
	Control		15.48	
Attitude Questionnaire:				
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	Experimental	1.39	7.78	1.88
	Control		8.70	
2. Rating of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	Experimental	.58	4.56	.83
	Control		5.00	
3. Rating of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	Experimental	.44	8.11	.52

TABLE XXIV (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	Control	8.60		8.60	
	Experimental	3.25	1.03	3.33	1.02
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	Control	2.85		2.85	
	Experimental	5.66	3.07	4.67	.03
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	Control	4.77		4.77	
	Experimental	10.75	1.32	10.22	.09
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	Control	9.97		9.97	
	Experimental	5.33	.09	5.44	.01
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	Control	5.50		5.50	
	Experimental	2.75	1.56	3.78	15.12**
9. Amount of black contact (item 17)	Control	2.38		2.38	
	Experimental	10.92	1.34	11.44	.37
10. Amount of white contact (item 18)	Control	12.05		12.05	
	Experimental	6.75	5.36*	8.78	.20
	Control	9.37		9.37	

= 2

TABLE XXIV (CONTINUED)

	White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
	Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
11. Police want to understand blacks (item 20)				
Experimental	2.75	.58	2.56	.09
Control	2.40		2.40	
12. Police guilty of abuse (item 21)				
Experimental	1.25	.01	1.11	.40
Control	1.27		1.27	
13. Blacks laugh at police (item 22)				
Experimental	2.17	.25	2.11	.32
Control	2.38		2.38	
14. Blacks are most criminal (items 23, 30)				
Experimental	6.00	.05	4.78	2.54
Control	6.18		6.17	
15. Poverty and crime caused (items 24, 25)				
Experimental	4.67	.22	6.44	7.80**
Control	4.38		4.37	
16. Community controlled police important (item 26)				
Experimental	3.33	1.80	3.78	.08
Control	3.90		3.90	
17. Separate police-community relations important (item 27)				
Experimental	3.17	.09	3.56	.27
Control	3.30		3.30	
18. Blacks assumed guilty (item 28)				
Experimental	1.92	.01	2.33	1.50
Control	1.88		1.88	

TABLE XXIV (CONTINUED)

		White Leader N = 12		Black Leader N = 9	
		Means	F ratios	Means	F ratios
19. Police-community relations important (item 29)	Experimental	1.42	.02	1.56	.33
	Control	1.38		1.38	
20. Name calling by police bad (item 31)	Experimental	1.42	.36	1.78	4.94*
	Control	1.30		1.30	
21. Blacks want more police (item 32)	Experimental	1.41	.25	1.56	.85
	Control	1.29		1.30	
22. Blacks work hard (item 33)	Experimental	1.67	1.16	2.00	4.86*
	Control	1.40		1.40	
23. Two separate police unions best (item 34)	Experimental	3.83	.02	4.00	.04
	Control	3.40		3.90	
24. Police brutality exaggerated (item 35)	Experimental	2.42	.20	2.67	.74
	Control	2.22		2.22	

*significant at the .05 level

be dangerous to put too much weight on any backlash conclusion since there is little logic to support it. The only possible explanation which might be offered is that if these officers perceived the black leader as being more militant than they were or if they saw him as anti-police, they might be forced to close ranks with their fellow white officers in order to defend their own professional identity from outside attack. This is, of course, quite speculative.

Thus the overall treatment effects for black officers show none of the positive features found in Phase I. One would have predicted that the group experience would have produced an increased emphasis on such softer values as helpful, forgiveness, equality and, perhaps, loving. Instead, experimentals became more cognitive and intellectual and, if anything, less concerned with these more affect laden values. There was no evidence that group experience lessened the polarity of black officers' feelings about whites and, if there was any trend, it was in the opposite direction. There was also some indication that black officers who had a black leader may have shifted more in terms of supporting viewpoints held by white officers. However, in view of the small sample size, this result can only be considered suggestive.

Discussion

There is very little evidence to support any conclusion that the training program was successful in achieving its goals. Neither was there any sign of the severe backlash effect which seemed to accompany the academy group sessions. This apparently was avoided by structuring the program in such a way that its racially motivated aspects were played down

so that all officers might see it as something to enhance their functioning efficiency in day to day police work.

In spite of the fact that experimental whites did rate their liking for blacks as greater than the officers who received no group training, it is difficult not to view this result with skepticism. As mentioned, there were no supporting differences on more subtle measures such as the California E scale or the ranking of "equality" on the Rokeach scale. Neither were there differences on any of the other questionnaire items which dealt with attitudes towards blacks or black police. It is also difficult to interpret the meaning of the one other difference found between experimentals and controls, namely, on the statement that the police really want to understand black people. The greater disagreement by experimentals on this item could, for example, be interpreted as a negative position towards blacks. One could, of course, also argue that it represents greater empathy with the black position in that they are agreeing that the police are not really trying hard enough to understand the black point of view. However, officers working in all-white precincts were also found to disagree more with this statement than officers from blacker precincts (although non-significantly so). Since, in Chapter IV, it will also be shown that officers in white precincts are also significantly more prejudiced towards blacks on a number of major measures, then it might seem more likely that disagreement by white experimentals on this item could be given a negative interpretation. Thus what these officers may be saying is that neither they, nor anyone else, really wants to try to understand blacks any further. Thus, in terms of the goal of lessening prejudice or developing a more tolerant view of black people, there is really no evidence that the program had any impact.

Neither is there much support for the viewpoint that these men at least enlarged their horizons and became more tolerant or understanding in other ways. On such values as "helpful," "forgiving" and "broadminded" or on any other value which might be expected to change if a person became more sensitive to the viewpoints of others, there were not only no significant differences between experimentals and controls, but there were not even any trends in expected directions on these values. Instead most differences were even the converse of that which might have been predicted. Only on "polite," which might also have been expected to change, was there movement in a positive direction. Significant changes did take place on "pleasure" and "true friendship," with experimentals showing greater concern for these values, but this could hardly be used as evidence for the presence of greater empathy for others, especially the shift on the former value.

There are many indications that the race of the group leader also had a differential impact on white officers. All signs point to a more negative effect when the leader was black. One might wonder whether the greater concern shown for "social recognition" by whites with a black leader might not have resulted from their being confronted by someone of another race who also had considerably higher status than they enjoyed. Since the direction of this value was entirely opposite among white experimentals who had a white leader this does represent a possibility. It is, of course, quite speculative, but hostile reactions to minority groups have been documented by Teahan and Hug (1970) by whites who were confronted by successful blacks. In that investigation more liberal, white, middle class high school students became more prejudiced towards both blacks and foreigners on the California E scales after viewing, over a twelve week

period, films of successful professional men of whom half were black. It was hypothesized that the cognitive dissonance and status threat which were aroused by viewing minority group figures, who had even more prestigious positions than the fathers of these suburban students, resulted in a backlash reaction. It is interesting to note in the present study that there was also significantly greater prejudice towards foreigners among group members on the same California E scale when a black group leader was used. In addition, these same white officers were found to be higher on authoritarianism (although non-significantly so). Actually, observations of means reveal that there is a trend towards more positive attitudes on all these scales when a white leader was used, while results are in the opposite direction when a black leader was involved. This is, of course, still contradicted by the fact that all whites, regardless of group leader, were still significantly different from their controls on the questionnaire item dealing with "liking for blacks" which has been described previously as seeming to represent more of a "lip service" phenomenon. Again, however, even on this variable, white experimentals who had a white leader were the only ones who were significantly different from their controls.

In contrast to the findings of Phase I where group experience apparently created more positive feelings among black officers in terms of their perceived relationship to the rest of the department, there is no evidence that the training program produced any such results in the second phase. It may well be that white black officers in the academy were more favorably impressed by a program to improve black-white relations, that neither the presence of the groups or the opportunity for involvement had the same impact after they had become "jaded" by regular police work. Of

course, the fact that racial implications were no longer placed in such prominent focus might also have played some role. Thus it may be that while toning down the wish for greater black-white harmony as a stated goal of the group program may have avoided the backlash effect among whites observed in the academy, it may also have removed some of the positive impact that had been observed among black participants.

One of the most striking changes which did take place among present black experimentals is the rise of cognitive-intellectual values in their hierarchy. Thus, following group experience, they showed increased interest in "wisdom," "intellectual," and "logical" while they became less concerned about more soft affective values such as "forgiveness" and even "helpful." This kind of shift is certainly contrary to the changes expected from sensitivity groups where greater openness in the expression of feelings is reinforced. Rokeach (1971), in his study of police officers, felt that they were characterized by intellectual detachment because of their need to adjust to a rigid, authority hierarchy which characterizes the police system. Apparently group sessions in which attention was focused on biases and attitudes which might affect an officer's performance of duty made black officers even more detached, and perhaps more thoughtful than ever. This, however, also seemed to work in opposition to the development of a more affective orientation which, perhaps, could be perceived as dysfunctional in police work in the same way that Triandis (1972) suggests that interpersonal trust and kindness may even hamper adjustment in inner-city ghettos.

However, if these greater shifts in intellectual detachment are actually related to more effective performance as police officers it is difficult to determine why these did not take place among whites who

underwent training. Since these changes appear to be race specific they may be more related to defensive changes among blacks who are trying to find a more adequate adjustment in a work setting where racial problems continue to emerge. Since training emphasized learning how to react without letting extreme bias interfere with efficiency, it could be that blacks, in particular, were learning how to "cool it" by becoming more remote from racially inflammatory material. Another alternative in dealing with racial issues is to use denial and pretend that the problems do not exist. It is interesting to note, in this respect, as will be discussed in Chapter IV, that black officers in white precincts seem most characterized by the tendency to deny racial problems and they tend to adopt a point of view more similar to their white fellow officers. In addition, these same officers also place less value on intellectual, logical and wisdom, than do officers from blacker precincts, although the differences do not quite reach the level required for statistical significance. It might suggest, however, that if an officer begins to recognize and confront the existence of racial problems, intellectual detachment might be the most useful method of effectively handling it. Again, however, this is sheerly speculative and further investigation would be needed to shed more light on the possibility that the intellectually aloof officer is best equipped to deal with racially toned incidents.

In terms of the overall treatment effect for blacks, aside from the above speculations, there was no evidence that the program resulted in their feeling more positive towards or accepted by the department, as seemed true of Phase I experimentals. Instead, if the trends are in any direction they may be more in terms of greater militancy among blacks involved in the group program.

One of the most interesting findings to emerge again has to do with the differential effect of a group leader's race on the attitudes of black officers. Having a black leader seemed related to their placing significantly less emphasis on "equality" (which is essentially the opposite found among blacks with a white leader) and there were a number of significant shifts which suggest that these same black officers became more defensive about police operations and perhaps even rather negative towards black civilians.

One cannot help but wonder whether some of this might not have resulted from the perception of these officers that the black leader was more negative towards the police than they were themselves, thus placing them in the difficult position of either siding with the department against an outsider, or joining in on the side of the perceived attacker. As Kelly (1972) has pointed out in her study of police-community training, this is a particularly sensitive problem with black officers who are involved in any kind of confrontation groups. They often find themselves in the very difficult position of choosing to defend policemen in general or of defending their own blackness. It must be admitted that in the case of one black leader, there were complaints made by white officers that he was too aggressive in "unearthing racism" and that he had verbally attacked members of one group. For this reason another leader was later used to handle the next two groups. It might also be noted that this second leader, who was quite careful not to be drawn into these kinds of racial confrontations, received his greatest harassment from a black officer who was suspicious of him as an outsider and who even went so far, on occasion, as to run a traffic and criminal record check on him through the departmental facilities. The officer even announced this in the group!

Such behavior suggests that black leaders may have been perceived with just as much, or even greater suspicion and hostility by black officers as they were by white officers. Thus even if these leaders were not critical of the department they might still have been perceived as potentially hostile outsiders, by black officers, who then became even more defensive about police functions than they were with a white leader.

The question still rises as to whether any of the reported changes on values, which were found, could represent any positive effects from the training program. As mentioned, it is not easy to find anything of this nature among white officers and it is questionable whether the greater emphasis on intellectual-cognitive values found among black officers can be interpreted in this light. This is especially so since there were no similar changes among white officers, although the question was raised as to whether black officers might need to utilize different defenses so as to both recognize the presence of racial problems and yet maintain some degree of detachment in order to deal with them effectively. One could also argue that positive changes in officers might have taken place but that the instruments used for measurement were inadequate to reflect these. Perhaps a follow-up using more behavioral indices which were related to improved interpersonal skills such as the absence of civilian complaints, citations, or perhaps improvement in supervisor ratings, might have revealed differences missed by paper and pencil measures. At any rate it is difficult to reach any conclusion other than that the program was unable to achieve its stated goals.

If the program was not successful then the next important question concerns what would have been necessary to set up an effective training system which could deal with the obviously great racial polarization going

on within the department. As Chapter III of this study clearly illustrates, racial problems are escalating at an alarming rate. As Kelly (1972) concluded in her study, if sensitivity type training or role playing which concentrates on the emotions and reactions of police are to be utilized, consideration should be given to adopting an eight hour training day. This, she feels would allow for a high degree of concentration on learning and emotional reactions so that the impact would be greater. In addition, the present investigator would add that it may be necessary to concentrate on an entire part of the system that affects the men rather than trying to deal with the individual patrolman. As family therapists such as Haley (1972), Ackerman (1966) and others point out, it is futile to try and deal with the behavior of one family member while ignoring the impact of the family system on him. So too it may be necessary to deal with the officer's "family system." This would mean working intensively with an entire precinct and attempting to have an impact especially on the more important members of that system such as the ranking officers and **sup**ervisors, as well as with a majority of the peer group who play such an important role in shaping attitudes. As Chapter IV of this study clearly indicates, precincts, and especially the racial composition of precincts, have a tremendous effect on the development of positive or negative racial attitudes.

Thus a random selection of officers from all precincts across the city, as was done in the present study, may simply be inadequate because too many other counter-pressures and influences exist. One way of testing this would be to concentrate one's efforts on an entire part of the system, namely a precinct, and see whether one could successfully modify this system in the direction one desired. To dilute one's efforts, as the

present study did, may quite likely be the least efficient and most uneconomical of all approaches.

CHAPTER III

INITIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BLACK AND WHITE OFFICERS AND CHANGES IN ATTITUDES OVER TIME

Although there have been considerable studies dealing with values, attitudes and personality characteristics of selected samples of white police officers (Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969; Niederhoffer, 1967; Rokeach, 1971; McNamara, 1967), few have dealt with these same characteristics in black police officers. One obvious reason for this is that many of the cities involved had no black officers at the time of these investigations, or had too few to make comparison possible. Alex (1969) has attempted to document the perceptions and frustrations characteristic of black police officers in a large metropolitan police department, but his data are essentially subjective and impressionistic, since he relied on interviews. There was no systematic method of sampling, nor was there any attempt to directly compare his results with a similar sample of white police officers. Although Kephart (1957) reported on both black and white officers, and one can infer from his data that black and white differences in the perception of many issues existed, there were still no systematic comparisons made which clearly identified areas of agreement and disagreement, or similarities and differences.

Of equal interest is the controversy which has existed regarding whether the attitudes and values of police are the result of their working

class background, or due to their entrance into and socialization by an institution whose function is the defense and preservation of the status quo--or whether both of these factors are responsible for the conservative political orientation reported by Bayley and Mendelsohn (1969), Guthrie (1963) and others. Many investigators (Lipset, 1969; Kephart, 1957; and Rokeach, 1971) have concluded that the value orientations found to be typical of police have predisposed them to select police work rather than some other occupation and they report that there is little evidence to support the hypothesis that police values are also, in great part, shaped by their law enforcement experiences.

Unfortunately, almost all studies quoted to support this conclusion have been cross-sectional rather than longitudinal and they have all had one very faulty premise, namely, that socialization, if it does play some role, comes about in a slow and gradual fashion. Thus both Rokeach (1971) and Kephart (1957) divided their sample of subjects into categories spanning rather large gaps of time. Kephart grouped together all men with zero through four years on the force and compared them to men with five through nine years of experience and with men of ten years experience or more. Rokeach used, as his lowest category, men with up to three years of police work, comparing them with men who had been on the force from four to ten years, eleven through twenty years, and finally with men who had more than twenty years experience. Quite probably these large time spans at lower level categories were used simply because there were too few men who had, let us say, only one year of service. However, most police officers with whom the present investigator has spoken to on this topic have all felt that the greatest changes which took place in their value orientation occurred during their first year of duty. Of course, it would be

impossible to study changes of this nature if one dealt with all men who had spent from zero to four years on the force as a homogenous category, particularly when it is not even clear whether these men had already put in close to the full four years of experience rather than representing the entire spread ranging from inexperienced rookies to confirmed officers.

Bayley and Mendelsohn (1969) did study some attitudes of police cadets at various points in the academy, following them into regular police work. However, most of the measures reported by them had little to do with values and attitudes representing a conservative or liberal viewpoint towards life. One exception to this was the California F scale where they found no differences between first and third month cadets and, of course, like other investigators (Niederhoffer, 1967; McNamara, 1967), they discovered that police were not significantly different from other working class men. Most of their other measures, however, dealt with the men's perception of supervisors and various aspects of training. They found, for example, that patrolmen were less in favor of strict supervision after they left the academy than they had been prior to this. There were, however, some shifts in attitudes regarding perceived public cooperation and cadets, who were initially skeptical about public support of the police, became more hopeful prior to graduation but then regressed back to their original level after one year on the force. Along with this the investigators found that cynicism increased among officers as well as the feeling that "force was justified to gain respect."

Thus there were some shifts reported by these investigators and, if their results tend to lean in any direction, they suggest that a hardening of attitudes, in terms of increased cynicism and a greater dependency on use of force to accomplish ends, does take place during the first year

of duty. Since the present study followed officers from the time of their entrance into the police academy until eighteen months later, an analysis of their initial values and the shifts that had taken place over time could be made.

Results

Initial Attitudes of White and Black Officers:

Differences between 149 white and 31 black officers on the Rokeach Scale of Values, upon first entering the academy, are shown in Tables XXV and XXVI. The largest difference, as expected, is that black officers placed far greater value on "equality," ranking it second, while whites placed it eighth. This difference is significant at far beyond the one percent level ($t=5.82$). Whites, on the other hand, place greater importance than blacks on "an exciting life" ($t=2.64$, significant at the .01 level), "a sense of accomplishment" ($t=3.15$, significant at the .01 level) and "true friendship" ($t=2.42$, significant at the .05 level).

On Instrumental Values in Table XXVI, blacks ranked "clean" as far more important than whites ($t=2.86$, significant at the .01 level), while, consistent with their greater emphasis on accomplishment, whites ranked "logical" as far more important than blacks ($t=2.76$, significant at the .01 level).

In Table XXVII, more black-white differences can be seen on the other attitude measures used. Predictably, blacks show far less negative feelings toward other blacks in terms of their lower California E (Negro) Scale ($t=7.03$, significant beyond the .01 level). They also feel that the relationships between black and white police officers are poorer than do

TABLE XXV

TERMINAL VALUE MEANS, COMPOSITE RANK ORDERS AND + RATIOS FOR BLACK AND WHITE POLICE OFFICERS

	Whites N=149			Blacks N=31			
	Means	SD's	Rank	Means	SD's	Rank	+ Ratios
A comfortable life	10.68	4.95	13	10.32	5.04	10	.36
An exciting life	9.39	4.87	9	11.90	4.82	13	2.64**
A sense of accomplishment	5.97	4.03	2	8.48	4.04	7	3.15**
A world at peace	8.29	5.34	7	7.00	5.42	6	1.21
A world of beauty	13.48	3.97	17	13.27	4.36	16	.248
Equality	8.69	4.73	8	4.64	3.21	2	5.82**
Family security	4.37	3.48	1	3.74	3.01	1	1.02
Freedom	6.27	4.36	3	5.84	3.46	3	.60
Happiness	7.57	4.47	5	8.52	4.23	8	1.12
Inner harmony	10.38	4.45	12	11.23	4.29	11	.99
Mature love	9.91	4.22	10	9.71	3.86	9	.26
National security	10.84	4.89	14	11.64	5.33	12	.78
Pleasure	13.18	3.50	16	13.36	3.58	17	.25

TABLE XXV (CONTINUED)

	Whites N=149			Blacks N=31			
	Means	SD's	Rank	Means	SD's	Rank	t Ratios
Salvation	14.05	5.14	18	12.45	5.84	15	1.42
Self-respect	6.66	3.96	4	6.77	3.60	5	.15
Social recognition	13.04	4.26	15	13.48	2.99	18	.69
True friendship	10.29	4.02	11	12.06	3.63	14	2.42*
Wisdom	8.00	4.66	6	6.61	4.54	4	1.54

130

*significant at .05

**significant at .01

TABLE XXVI

INSTRUMENTAL VALUE MEANS, COMPOSITE RANK ORDERS AND + RATIOS FOR BLACK AND WHITE POLICE OFFICERS

	Whites N=149			Blacks N=31			
	Means	SD's	Rank	Means	SD's	Rank	+ Ratios
Ambitious	6.63	4.73	2	6.90	5.37	4	.26
Broadminded	7.23	4.64	4	6.68	3.77	3	.71
Capable	7.86	4.59	6.5	9.58	4.46	9	1.95
Cheerful	13.23	4.17	17	12.03	4.28	16	1.42
Clean	10.52	5.15	11	7.97	4.38	6	2.86**
Courageous	7.86	4.42	6.5	9.45	4.79	8	1.70
Forgiving	11.34	4.73	16	11.26	5.00	13	.08
Helpful	9.27	4.54	8	8.77	4.94	7	.48
Honest	4.79	3.95	1	5.23	4.01	1	.55
Imaginative	13.37	4.69	18	12.61	4.85	18	.79
Independent	10.28	5.44	10	10.68	5.42	12	.37
Intellectual	11.11	5.40	13	10.29	5.05	11	.81
Logical	9.53	4.78	9	12.32	5.19	17	2.76**

TABLE XXVI (CONTINUED)

	Whites N=149			Blacks N=31			† Ratios
	Means	SD's	Rank	Means	SD's	Rank	
Loving	11.09	5.05	12	11.64	5.54	14	.51
Obedient	11.12	4.72	14	11.81	4.63	15	.75
Polite	11.24	4.03	15	10.23	4.22	10	1.23
Responsible	6.87	4.00	3	6.19	3.72	2	.90
Self-controlled	7.54	4.47	5	7.36	5.36	5	.18

TABLE XXVII

COMPARISON OF BLACK AND WHITE POLICE OFFICERS ON
THE CALIFORNIA F AND E SCALES AND ON
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Social Survey Questions:	Whites N=149		Blacks N=31		t Ratios
	Means	SD's	Means	SD's	
F Scale	85.91	15.52	84.03	19.64	.50
Ethnocentrism Negroes	21.76	8.00	14.19	4.76	7.03**
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	19.37	5.41	18.55	6.71	.64
Attitude Questionnaire					
Variable:					
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	8.09	2.050	8.065	2.35	.05
2. Ratings of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	5.34	1.37	4.94	1.21	1.64
3. Ratings of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	5.42	1.73	6.45	1.80	2.91**
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	4.57	1.30	2.81	.83	9.60**
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	4.18	1.26	3.87	1.61	.09
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	7.72	1.03	8.58	.96	4.51**
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	8.20	1.02	6.90	1.14	5.87**

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	Whites N=149		Blacks N=31		† Ratios
	Means	SD's	Means	SD's	
8. Are black police equal professionals (Items 16, 19)	2.76	1.06	2.13	.50	4.97**
9. Amount of black contact (17)	8.28	2.58	11.37	2.80	5.59**
10. Amount of white contact (18)	11.18	2.79	9.68	3.19	6.66**
11. Police want to understand blacks (20)	2.08	.92	2.64	1.47	2.05*
12. Police guilty of abuse (21)	2.01	.89	1.74	1.21	1.18
13. Blacks laugh at police (22)	1.80	.82	2.39	1.26	2.50*
14. Blacks are most criminal (23, 30)	5.42	1.87	4.93	1.93	1.24
15. Poverty and crime caused (24, 25)	4.37	1.65	4.35	1.79	.05
16. Community controlled police (26)	3.99	1.18	3.81	1.35	.69
17. Separate police-community relations (27)	3.80	1.11	3.29	1.24	2.14*
18. Blacks assumed guilty (28)	2.78	1.12	2.60	1.24	.75
19. Police-community relations important (29)	1.37	.77	1.52	.99	.83
20. Name-calling by police (31)	1.64	.94	1.61	.99	.13
21. Blacks want more police (32)	2.01	.98	1.71	.82	1.76
22. Blacks work hard (33)	2.46	1.15	1.71	1.01	3.68**

TABLE XXVII (CONTINUED)

	Whites N=149		Blacks N=31		† Ratios
	Means	SD's	Means	SD's	
23. Two separate police unions is good (34)	4.56	.93	4.42	1.06	.69
24. Police brutality is exaggerated (35)	1.64	.88	2.52	1.29	3.63**

*significant at .05

**significant at .01

their white counterparts (Variable 3-- $t=2.91$, significant at the .01 level). Consistent with their E scale performance, they also express more positive feelings toward blacks on other questions dealing with this area (Variable 4) with a t of 9.60, significant beyond the .01 level. Also while whites feel that blacks get preferred treatment once they are admitted to the force (Variable 6-- $t=4.51$, significant beyond the .01 level), blacks (Variable 7) feel that it is whites who get preferential treatment in terms of promotions, assignments, etc., ($t=5.87$, significant beyond the .01 level).

Other results are also as would be predicted. Blacks feel more strongly than whites that black officers are equal as professionals (Variable 8-- $t=4.97$, significant at the .01 level). They also have greater contact with blacks (Variable 9) and less contact with whites (Variable 10) when compared to their white counterparts ($t=5.59$ and 6.66 respectively, both significant beyond the .01 level). Whites claim that police want to understand blacks more (Variable 11), but black officers disagree ($t=2.05$, significant at the .05 level). Black officers also feel more strongly than white officers that there should be a police-community relations unit separate from the police force (Variable 17-- $t=2.14$, significant at the .05 level) and they also feel, more strongly than white officers, that blacks work hard (Variable 22-- $t=3.68$, significant at the .01 level). White officers tend to see charges of police brutality as due mostly to misunderstanding, while black officers do not agree as strongly with this explanation (Variable 24-- $t=3.63$, significant beyond the .01 level).

In summary, then, black and white officers enter the academy with some pronounced differences in terms of values, as well as in their

perception of black-white problems, both these which exist within the department as well as those between the department and the black community. Blacks predictably stress "equality" as a high value in their hierarchy. Whites especially stress "a sense of accomplishment" and they place a significantly greater emphasis than blacks on "an exciting life" and "true friendship." On the whole blacks see more disturbances in black-white relationships both between the police and the community, as well as within the department itself. Essentially, blacks sharpen these black-white differences, while whites tend to minimize them or deny their presence.

Attitude Changes Over Time for Black and White

Officers

A repeated measures analysis of variance* was done to determine shifts in attitudes beginning with entrance into the academy, at graduation thirteen weeks later, and finally eighteen months following graduation. One of the most prominent shifts that seems to have taken place in white officers, over time, is their increased lack of interest in "equality." Table XXVIII shows a continual decrease in the importance given to this equality-brotherhood value from the time the officers entered the academy and the obtained F of 3.59 was significant at the .05 level. Also noted is a shift for all officers on this value ($F=24.35$, $p=.01$) but the movement of black officers is quite minimal with a slight increase in importance at graduation and then a mild decrease.

There also appears to be a strong hedonistic orientation appearing for both black and white officers which is reflected in a marked interest

*This analysis was done only on officers for whom there were test results available for all three periods of their police careers. Thus the sample size differs from the previous analysis on black and white officers.

TABLE XXVIII

REPEATED MEASURES, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TERMINAL VALUES UPON ENTERING POLICE
ACADEMY, AT GRADUATION AND EIGHTEEN MONTHS LATER

		Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
		Means	Means	df 1;119	df 2,238	df 2,238
A comfortable life	1. Entrance	11.60	10.92			
	2. Graduation	8.34	8.33	.36	26.01**	.24
	3. 18 months	8.46	7.62			
An exciting life	1. Entrance	9.59	11.54			
	2. Graduation	8.97	11.52	5.56*	1.13	.21
	3. 18 months	8.85	11.42			
A sense of accomplishment	1. Entrance	5.89	8.00			
	2. Graduation	5.66	7.96	7.33**	.35	.51
	3. 18 months	6.22	7.50			
A world at peace	1. Entrance	8.28	7.83			
	2. Graduation	9.13	9.71	.17	2.79	1.05
	3. 18 months	9.54	8.21			
A world of beauty	1. Entrance	13.09	13.08			
	2. Graduation	13.63	13.62	.06	2.56	.18
	3. 18 months	14.04	13.54			
Equality	1. Entrance	8.65	5.08			
	2. Graduation	10.79	4.46	49.63**	24.35**	3.59*
	3. 18 months	12.59	6.17			

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race df 1, 119	F ratios for Shift df 2, 238	F ratios for R X S df 2, 238
	Means	Means			
Family security					
1. Entrance	4.56	4.33			
2. Graduation	4.83	4.42	.01	.23	1.09
3. 18 months	4.54	5.42			
Freedom					
1. Entrance	5.98	6.21			
2. Graduation	6.44	7.21	.71	1.07	.29
3. 18 months	6.05	7.00			
Happiness					
1. Entrance	7.54	8.67			
2. Graduation	8.19	7.79	.00	.39	1.75
3. 18 months	7.98	7.25			
Inner harmony					
1. Entrance	10.10	11.04			
2. Graduation	10.71	10.58	.25	1.05	.42
3. 18 months	9.96	10.25			
Mature love					
1. Entrance	10.13	8.83			
2. Graduation	8.55	9.46	.04	4.43*	2.36
3. 18 months	9.61	9.54			
National security					
1. Entrance	10.66	11.96			
2. Graduation	11.72	14.12	4.89*	4.11*	.70
3. 18 months	10.96	13.46			
Pleasure					
1. Entrance	13.35	14.00			
2. Graduation	12.13	11.87	.79	10.01**	1.62
3. 18 months	11.69	13.12			

TABLE XXVIII (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race df 1, 119	F ratios for Shift df 2, 238	F ratios for R X S df 2, 238
	Means	Means			
Salvation					
1. Entrance	13.36	11.88			
2. Graduation	13.80	11.54	5.00*	.21	1.34
3. 18 months	13.91	10.58			
Self-respect					
1. Entrance	6.60	6.50			
2. Graduation	6.72	7.42	.27	.60	.39
3. 18 months	6.32	6.92			
Social recognition					
1. Entrance	13.06	12.92			
2. Graduation	12.52	12.88	.29	.83	.52
3. 18 months	12.32	13.29			
True friendship					
1. Entrance	10.56	11.92			
2. Graduation	10.54	10.67	2.66	25	1.51
3. 18 months	10.51	12.37			
Wisdom					
1. Entrance	8.03	6.29			
2. Graduation	8.37	7.42	1.93	1.76	.59
3. 18 months	7.46	6.92			

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

in "a comfortable life" ($F=26.01$, $p=.01$) and "pleasure" ($F=10.01$, $p=.01$). These changes, however, seem to have primarily taken place during the academy period and have remained relatively constant since then.

The significant movements on "mature love" ($F=4.43$, $p=.05$) and "national security" ($F=4.11$, $p=.05$), for both races, are difficult to interpret because the shifts seem inconsistent. Thus although whites rated the former as more important at graduation, it has become less important for them since then, while this same value dropped in significance for blacks since the beginning of their academy training. The opposite was true for "national security," however, in that both whites and blacks showed less interest in it at graduation and since that time it increased only slightly in importance.

One new racial difference appeared since graduation and that had to do with the increasing importance of "salvation" for blacks who began to value it significantly more than whites ($F=5.00$, $p=.05$) after being involved in regular police work. Whites, on the other hand, showed decreasing interest in this value.

Even more significant shifts took place on Instrumental Values (see Table XXIX) since officers became involved in regular police work. Both white and black officers became less interested in "helpful" ($F=6.60$, $p=.01$) and "forgiving" ($F=12.59$, $p=.01$) with whites placing even less importance on this latter value than blacks ($F=3.06$, $p=.05$). In this same vein "loving" dropped in importance ($F=4.13$, $p=.05$) as well as both "polite" ($F=4.97$, $p=.01$) and "obedience" ($F=11.31$, $p=.01$). These latter two made their most dramatic shifts during the academy training period itself. Indeed all officers appear to progressively deemphasize what could be called the softer, affective values and instead they have begun

TABLE XXIX

REPEATED MEASURES, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR INSTRUMENTAL VALUES UPON ENTERING POLICE ACADEMY,
AT GRADUATION AND EIGHTEEN MONTHS LATER

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
	Means	Means	df 1,119	df 2,238	df 2,238
Ambitious	1. Entrance	7.17			
	2. Graduation	6.71	1.57	1.12	.29
	3. 18 months	7.54			
Broadminded	1. Entrance	7.21			
	2. Graduation	8.92	.00	1.77	.24
	3. 18 months	8.25			
Capable	1. Entrance	9.54			
	2. Graduation	9.55	3.01	.30	.15
	3. 18 months	8.79			
Cheerful	1. Entrance	12.00			
	2. Graduation	12.17	.63	5.44**	1.00
	3. 18 months	13.25			
Clean	1. Entrance	8.67			
	2. Graduation	8.92	.64	.44	.89
	3. 18 months	9.50			
Courageous	1. Entrance	9.46			
	2. Graduation	7.75	.65	1.25	1.32
	3. 18 months	8.46			

TABLE XXIX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
	Means	Means	df 1,119	df 2,238	df 2,238
Forgiving					
1. Entrance	10.67	11.96			
2. Graduation	11.91	13.00	.21	12.59**	3.06*
3. 18 months	13.51	12.21			
Helpful					
1. Entrance	8.71	8.83			
2. Graduation	9.41	8.54	.02	6.60**	1.10
3. 18 months	10.37	11.46			
Honest					
1. Entrance	4.71	5.17			
2. Graduation	4.65	4.50	.20	.68	.26
3. 18 months	4.21	4.75			
imaginative					
1. Entrance	13.64	11.75			
2. Graduation	13.21	12.08	.78	1.64	3.12*
3. 18 months	12.19	13.25			
Independent					
1. Entrance	10.74	9.54			
2. Graduation	9.74	10.25	.51	2.78	.97
3. 18 months	9.41	8.21			
Intellectual					
1. Entrance	11.32	9.38			
2. Graduation	10.23	9.08	3.81	6.16**	.49
3. 18 months	9.59	7.17			
Logical					
1. Entrance	9.74	11.71			
2. Graduation	10.20	11.29	2.16	6.32**	.63
3. 18 months	8.71	9.38			

TABLE XXIX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
	Means	Means	df 1,119	df 2,238	df 2,238
Loving	1. Entrance	11.21			
	2. Graduation	8.79	.06	4.13*	.92
	3. 18 months	11.05			
Obedient	1. Entrance	11.05			
	2. Graduation	13.45	1.50	11.31**	1.88
	3. 18 months	12.45			
Polite	1. Entrance	11.01			
	2. Graduation	12.57	.16	4.00*	1.83
	3. 18 months	11.90			
Responsible	1. Entrance	7.33			
	2. Graduation	6.50	.03	1.30	2.81
	3. 18 months	6.59			
Self-controlled	1. Entrance	7.78			
	2. Graduation	7.44	2.53	.60	.34
	3. 18 months	7.73			

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

to place greater emphasis on a harder, more cognitive orientation so that values like "intellectual" and "logical" have now gained in importance, especially since graduation from the academy ($F=6.16$, $p=.01$ and $F=6.32$, $p=.01$, respectively).

The only shift which showed a racial interaction was on "imaginative" where whites showed an increasing interest while blacks revealed a decreasing interest ($F=3.12$, $p=.05$). It should also be noted that a previous racial pretest difference on "clean" (see Table XXII) has now disappeared eighteen months later. This may indicate that this value, which previous research by Rokeach has shown to be related to socioeconomic level (personal communication), may be quite sensitive to changes in living conditions as a result of greater financial security.

If there had been any doubt about an increase in the racial polarization of police officers since their entrance into the academy, this is entirely dispelled by Table XXX. Prejudice towards blacks has increased tremendously on the California E Scale over time ($F=44.30$, $p=.01$) and this is entirely due to white officers ($F=10.81$, $p=.01$). Perceived relationships between black and white officers are now seen as much worse by all officers (Variable 3, $F=38.64$, $p=.01$) and direct expression of negative feelings towards blacks has escalated (Variable 4, $F=25.75$, $p=.01$). Although the F for racial interaction just failed to reach the .05 level, an examination of the means responsible for the overall shift on Variable 4 reveals increasing negative feelings for blacks especially since white officers have graduated from the academy. Blacks, in turn express greater dislike for whites (Variable 5, $F=6.23$, $p=.01$), a feeling which has also continued to rise since they entered the academy.

TABLE XXX

REPEATED MEASURES, ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CALIFORNIA F AND E SCALES AND OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS
UPON ENTERING POLICE ACADEMY, AT GRADUATION AND EIGHTEEN MONTHS LATER

Social Survey Questions		Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
		Means	Means	df 1,119	df 2,238	df 2,238
F Scale	1. Entrance	87.22	82.29			
	2. Graduation	85.27	74.00	5.63*	3.79*	2.38
	3. 18 months	86.23	77.62			
E Scale (Negro)	1. Entrance	21.42	13.92			
	2. Graduation	22.72	13.42	43.23**	44.30**	10.81**
	3. 18 months	28.42	13.79			
E Scale (Foreigner)	1. Entrance	19.98	18.00			
	2. Graduation	19.02	16.17	5.75*	3.58*	.67
	3. 18 months	19.33	16.08			

Attitude Questionnaire

Variable

1. Rel. of blacks and police	1. Entrance	8.13	7.88			
	2. Graduation	8.27	8.50	.02	2.45	.54
	3. 18 months	8.50	8.71			
2. Rel. of whites and police	1. Entrance	5.36	4.79			
	2. Graduation	5.20	5.25	.62	1.49	1.59
	3. 18 months	5.02	4.96			

TABLE XXX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race df 1,119	F ratios for Shift df 2,238	F ratios for R X S df 2,238
	Means	Means			
3. Rel. of black and white police					
1. Entrance	5.41	6.33			
2. Graduation	6.52	7.38	6.50*	38.64**	.05
3. 18 months	7.27	8.29			
4. You and blacks					
1. Entrance	4.60	2.67			
2. Graduation	4.84	2.79	85.30**	25.75**	2.62
3. 18 months	5.62	3.00			
5. You and whites					
1. Entrance	4.26	3.83			
2. Graduation	4.25	4.54	.72	1.29	6.23**
3. 18 months	4.24	5.00			
6. Blacks in police					
1. Entrance	8.67	8.46			
2. Graduation	7.42	9.75	8.51**	3.53*	3.20*
3. 18 months	6.21	9.96			
7. Whites in police					
1. Entrance	9.19	7.04			
2. Graduation	8.50	6.25	18.37**	.69	1.00
3. 18 months	9.44	5.29			
8. Are black police equal					
1. Entrance	2.73	2.08			
2. Graduation	3.00	2.41	21.89**	82.83**	8.30**
3. 18 months	4.63	2.79			
9. Contact with blacks					
1. Entrance	8.37	15.21			
2. Graduation	8.14	11.75	34.75**	3.05*	2.88
3. 18 months	7.48	11.04			

TABLE XXX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
	Means	Means	df 1, 119	df 2, 238	df 2, 238
10. Contact with whites					
1. Entrance	13.16	9.87			
2. Graduation	11.29	8.54	8.58**	2.83	.04
3. 18 months	11.20	8.45			
11. Police want to know blacks					
1. Entrance	2.01	2.83			
2. Graduation	2.26	2.62	3.14	14.81**	6.67**
3. 18 months	2.86	2.58			
12. Police may abuse citizens					
1. Entrance	2.09	1.92			
2. Graduation	1.72	1.25	13.53**	9.77**	4.82**
3. 18 months	2.19	1.21			
13. Blacks ridicule police					
1. Entrance	1.81	2.33			
2. Graduation	1.77	2.17	9.68**	.83	.16
3. 18 months	1.67	2.21			
14. Blacks likely to be criminals					
1. Entrance	5.90	4.83			
2. Graduation	6.04	5.50	1.76	3.67*	2.59
3. 18 months	6.26	6.50			
15. Env. creates crime					
1. Entrance	4.45	5.46			
2. Graduation	4.22	5.21	5.14*	6.08**	1.10
3. 18 months	4.98	5.38			
16. Comm. controlled police					
1. Entrance	4.03	3.79			
2. Graduation	3.97	3.62	7.88**	1.01	3.44*
3. 18 months	4.30	3.25			

TABLE XXX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race df 1,119	F ratios for Shift df 2,238	F ratios for R X S df 2,238
	Means	Means			
17. Separate police-community rel. unit					
1. Entrance	3.84	3.12			
2. Graduation	3.82	3.25	15.28**	.54	.64
3. 18 months	3.77	2.83			
18. Blacks assumed guilty					
1. Entrance	2.76	3.00			
2. Graduation	2.57	1.92	5.06*	3.44*	5.18**
3. 18 months	2.89	2.00			
19. Police-community rela- tions necessary					
1. Entrance	1.43	1.62			
2. Graduation	1.52	1.50	.51	6.09**	3.45*
3. 18 months	1.92	1.42			
20. Verbal abuse bad					
1. Entrance	1.56	1.79			
2. Graduation	1.55	1.29	1.71	6.24**	4.95**
3. 18 months	1.95	1.42			
21. Blacks want protection					
1. Entrance	2.12	1.83			
2. Graduation	2.01	1.42	9.91**	.87	.78
3. 18 months	2.15	1.46			
22. Blacks work hard					
1. Entrance	2.42	1.79			
2. Graduation	2.34	1.42	22.76**	22.13**	4.15**
3. 18 months	3.05	1.71			
23. Separate police assoc.					
1. Entrance	4.70	4.41			
2. Graduation	4.46	2.62	13.88**	6.75**	1.82
3. 18 months	4.37	2.67			

TABLE XXX (CONTINUED)

	Whites N = 97	Blacks N = 24	F ratios for Race	F ratios for Shift	F ratios for R X S
	Means	Means	df 1,119	df 2,238	df 2,238
24. Police brutality exaggerated					
1. Entrance	1.64	2.75			
2. Graduation	1.34	2.16	40.81**	4.81**	1.23
3. 18 months	1.59	2.25			

*significant at the .05 level
 **significant at the .01 level

White officers also believe, more and more, that blacks receive preferential treatment in the police department (Variable 6, $F=3.20$, $p=.05$). Blacks, on the other hand, see more preference given to whites (Variable 7, $F=18.37$, $p=.01$) and although the shift since graduation has been slight, there has been a continued increase in their perception of white preferential treatment. White officers also express more negative feelings towards their black fellow officers in terms of their professional equality (Variable 8, $F=8.30$, $p=.01$). Although it may be noted that all police shifted on this item ($F=82.83$, $p=.01$), the changes which took place for white officers are likely due to different reasons than the shift for black officers. One of the items which contributes to this variable concerns the issue of integrated scout cars and one can probably assume that a shift for blacks, on this variable, is due to their sentiments about having a partner of the same race, since it would be highly unlikely that they would agree more strongly with a statement that blacks are inferior professionally to white police. Thus this change for all officers likely represents increased polarity between blacks and whites as they demand segregated duty.

This last hypothesis is given support by the increased desire of both blacks and whites for two separate police associations, one for each race (Variable 23, $F=6.75$, $p=.01$). Understandably, they disagree on the issue of black community control of police with whites opposing it and blacks supporting it with increased vigor since the academy (Variable 16, $F=3.44$, $p=.05$). They also disagree on the importance of police-community relations with blacks again supporting and whites opposing (Variable 19, $F=3.45$, $p=.05$).

White police also report an increase in the feeling that police do not really want to understand black people (Variable 11, $F=6.67$, $p=.01$) which may be a projections of their own personal feelings. Black officers, on the other hand, deny this, which may represent a wish to be more accepted and understood by other blacks (F for total shift, 14.81 , $p=.01$). White police are still defensive, however, and disagree even more than they did at graduation with the implication that police may be guilty of abusing citizens, while blacks agree more than ever with the statement (Variable 12, $F=4.82$, $p=.01$). Both races, however, show greater agreement than ever with the statement that blacks are more likely to be involved in criminal behavior (Variable 14, $F=3.67$, $p=.05$) and both are willing to assign some responsibility for crime and poverty to unavoidable environmental circumstances (Variable 15, $F=6.08$, $p=.01$).

One interesting related item is that although both races had tended to agree more at graduation with the statement that many complaints of police brutality and harrassment were due to misinformation and misunderstanding, both groups of officers have now moved back in the direction of disagreeing with this statement (Variable 24, $F=4.81$, $p=.05$). This suggests some ambivalence on the part of officers, in view of their response to Variable 12, where whites denied brutality and blacks admitted it. Blacks, however, still admit to the possibility of police harrassment of citizens at a significantly greater level than do whites (F for race on Variable 12 = 4.82 , $p=.01$). In this same vein white police also show an increasing negativism towards blacks in their even stronger sentiment that blacks do not work hard (Variable 22, $F=4.15$, $p=.05$). However, black officers also appear to defend their fellow blacks less, than they had at graduation, and have moved somewhat in the same direction as white

officers, as can be seen in the overall shift ($F=22.13$, $p=.01$) on this item. Thus they now agree less strongly than previously about the productivity of blacks. Here again we are confronted with the ambivalence of black officers who seem to shift from support to condemnation of other blacks which suggests that they must feel under constant pressure from the opinion of the white majority with whom they work.

Perhaps only two findings could be considered in any way indicative of some positive shifts in attitudes. Black officers, upon graduation, had dropped considerably in their F scale scores, indicating a marked decrease in authoritarianism during the academy training period. This was clearly indicated by the repeated measures analysis done in phase one where the F for shift at that time (see Table XII in phase one) was 20.63 which is significant far beyond the .001 level. As can be seen in Table XII this lower level of authoritarianism has been maintained for the most part, although their slight shift upward during the next 18 months resulted in the F ratio for race interaction falling just below the level required for statistical significance ($F=2.38$). However they are still significantly lower than whites on this scale ($F=5.63$, $p=.05$). In addition to this change both whites and blacks showed a decrease in ethnocentrism towards foreigners ($F=3.58$, $p=.05$) although examination of these means reveals that again this is primarily due to black officers dropping in their scores.

Summary of Changes

It is very clear that great polarization between black and white officers has taken place since their initial entrance into the academy.

Although some of this occurred prior to graduation, most of this increased hostility between races took place during their regular police work. (See pre-post test shifts in Phase I tables which confirm this.) This is supported by the increasing lack of interest in equality shown by white officers as well as by their marked rise in ethnocentrism on the California Scale and other attitude measures concerning feelings about blacks. Blacks, on the other hand, show increasing negativism towards whites, especially since graduation. More than ever, white officers also see blacks as receiving preferential treatment by the police department, while blacks perceive the opposite. Both groups seem to be indicating, more and more, a wish for greater segregation in terms of separate police associations and same-race police partners in scout cars. Blacks want more community control over police and greater emphasis on police community relations while whites oppose both.

An equally unfortunate change has also occurred for all officers since they entered the academy. This concerns their increasing lack of interest in such values as "helpful," "forgiving," "loving," "polite" and "obedience." This would appear to indicate a hardening attitude on their part, in their dealings with other people, with softer, affective values being replaced by a more detached approach. Further support for this is seen in the increased importance given to "intellectual" and "logical." In addition, their greater hedonistic orientation in terms of the higher value they place on "pleasure" and "a comfortable life" also has possible negative implications. All this could suggest that they begin to see themselves less and less as a helping profession which deals with people in a tactful, understanding manner. Instead they seem to be moving more in the direction of pragmatic efficiency with less compassionate, humanistic

regard for others, and more concern for their own comfort and welfare.

White officers even seem to be moving to a point where they no longer even care about appearances. Thus they are now more willing to admit that police do not even want to understand black people. Black officers, in contrast, claim, more than ever, that police desire greater understanding of blacks although they are also more willing, than white officers, to admit that police brutality still exists. However, one also sees some signs of confusion and ambivalence in black officers, with the suggestion that they may feel pulled in two different directions. Thus while they are trying to improve their image in the eyes of the black community and maintain their identification with them, at the same time they are trying to reconcile this with their identity as police officers who serve along side of the white majority within the department. Thus they alternate between defending and criticizing blacks, and admitting and denying police harassment and brutality. Their perception of higher black involvement in crime may be connected to this ambivalence.

Perhaps the only positive finding which one can identify is the fact that black officers continue to maintain their lower level of authoritarianism since graduation. They also drop, over time, in their negative attitude towards some out-groups. However, in view of the increasing polarity between races found during this eighteen month period it is difficult to find much source of comfort or optimism in this finding.

Discussion of Racial Differences and Attitude Shifts

The initial differences in values between black and white officers, as they enter the academy, are, in many ways, similar to those reported by

Rokeach (1971) who compared confirmed police officers with a national sample of both white and black non-police. In both his and the present study, one of the largest differences between blacks and whites was in terms of equality. White police rate equality as relatively unimportant in their hierarchy and related to this is their significantly higher level of prejudice and lower expression of positive feelings towards Negroes on the other attitude measures used. Essentially whites initially feel that black-white problems are not as crucial as blacks feel they are. In keeping with this is their disagreement over the importance of having a police-community relations unit separate from the force and their feelings that reports of police brutality are exaggerated or at least due to misinformation.

Blacks initially also see greater friction within the department between black and white officers. The tendency of whites to soft-pedal this friction more than blacks is especially interesting in view of the fact that each group accuses the other of receiving preferential treatment in terms of assignments, promotions, etc. This, together with a tendency for white officers to downgrade blacks as being less professional than themselves in police work suggests that some denial is involved in their responses regarding black-white departmental frictions at this stage of their police career.

What we see here, then, is a tendency for each group, when they enter the academy, to point an accusing finger at the other. Thus whites feel that blacks tend to promote hostility towards the police by encouraging other blacks to denounce or ridicule the police. They also protest initially that police officers are trying to understand people more.

Black officers, on the other hand, disagree, or at least do not agree with the same amount of conviction.

Any apparent signs of soft-pedaling by white officers regarding black-white frictions certainly have begun to diminish at graduation from the academy and, after eighteen months of regular police duty, they have entirely disappeared. Extreme polarization of attitudes between races seems most apparent on almost every test measure dealing with negative attitudes towards blacks. Equality-brotherhood has shifted markedly even further in the direction of increased disinterest on the part of whites, and dramatic rises have taken place in ethnocentrism on the California Scale and other attitude scales measuring negative feelings towards either black officers or black people in general. Whites are not even bothering to give lip service to the importance of police community relations any longer, nor are they even as willing to admit, as they had previously, that verbal abuse of citizens is bad. In addition, they no longer even insist, to the same degree as during the academy, that they are even trying to understand black people. Instead they are agreeing, more than ever, that separate police associations and more segregated duty may be the best course of action. They also feel, even more strongly, that black officers receive preferential treatment in terms of assignments and promotions and, predictably, they feel hostile about it.

Similarly, black officers have also become more disillusioned about black-white relationships within the department. They, in turn, have become more negative in their evaluation of whites, and they feel, even more strongly than ever, that white police receive greater preferential treatment. In a manner identical to white officers they too are more in favor of two police associations, one for blacks and one for whites.

They also are showing greater interest in segregated scout car duty. It is difficult to determine just how much of the increased wish for two police unions may be due to the greater recruiting efforts on the part of the black officer's organization which is attempting to increase its strength among blacks. However, in view of their increasing perception of discriminatory practices on the part of the department in terms of promotions, etc., this finding suggests that they feel that it is only through a collective black association that they can achieve their ends.

It is, of course, impossible to generalize these findings of increased racial polarity in the police beyond the city in which this study was conducted. Whether it is becoming a common phenomenon in all cities where the balance of power between blacks and whites is shifting, as more black officers enter the force, is difficult to determine. Certainly, however, these results are not surprising in view of newspaper reports of increasing confrontations and open conflict between black and white officers. It is also impossible to determine whether these shifts have taken place because of the experiences of officers in their street duty or whether these changes represent a general polarization of attitudes encompassing the entire police department over the past year. Thus would we now find that even academy recruits show this same degree of polarization, especially in view of the greater recent publicity which has been given to racial unrest within the police ranks? Or do black and/or white officers enter the academy with a somewhat idealized image of race relations within the department only to become more prejudiced or polarized as they become more involved in regular police duty? There is some evidence in the present results which would suggest that the latter takes place to some extent, at least among black officers.

Perhaps related to this last conjecture are those results where blacks and whites initially agreed but in which they later diverged. For example, both black and white cadets had almost identical F scale scores upon entering the academy and they showed no differences in prejudice expressed towards foreigners on the California E Scale. Also, in spite of the fact that whites and blacks were found to differ in terms of their expressed liking for blacks, there were no differences between the two groups in their initial expressed liking for whites. (This of course changed, for blacks, especially after graduation from the academy.) In addition, although both black and white officers admitted that the relationship between whites and police was better than between blacks and police, both groups agreed that the state of affairs between blacks and police was fairly harmonious--i.e. their ratings averaged out on the positive side of the scale and they did not differ from one another. Also, even though black cadets reported perceiving greater conflicts between black and white officers than did their white counterparts, this did not carry over in terms of their perception of police-black community relations, nor did blacks, as mentioned, report liking whites any less than did their fellow officers.

However, by the time black officers were ready for graduation, there had been a significant decrease in authoritarianism and in negative feelings towards foreigners on the California scales. These differences are still as pronounced eighteen months later. Black officers thus became increasingly more liberal in their general outlook towards life, in comparison to whites. One possible explanation for this may involve the greater disillusionment about black-white problems which also occurred and which may have modified their authoritarian stance and made them more

tolerant towards other foreign out-groups. A further examination of the data gives some support to this hypothesis. First, a high correlation was found, on pretest data, between the California F Scale and E Scale towards foreigners ($r=.79$, $p=.01$). This is similar to that reported by Adorno *et al* (1950). In addition, when correlations were made between the F scale and other measures for black officers only, an interesting picture of the high F black emerged. A high authoritarian black agrees that blacks get along well with the police ($r=-.48$, $p=.01$), he also expresses positive feelings towards whites ($r=-.48$, $p=.01$), he agrees that blacks often encourage other blacks to laugh at the police ($r=-.46$, $p=.01$), he disagrees that a black, community controlled police force is a good thing ($r=-.37$, $p=.05$) and lastly, he feels that instances of police brutality are often exaggerated ($r=-.38$, $p=.05$).

A further examination of the test data in terms of the correlations between changes which have taken place from pre- to post-testing during the academy period offered further verification of this impression. As F scale scores decreased so did ethnocentrism towards foreigners ($r=.54$, significant at the .01 level). There was also some evidence that as authoritarianism goes down, the amount of contact with other blacks goes up ($r=-.30$ $p=.09$). Although this and the other correlations were not statistically significant, when one considers the limited range and variance offered by these change scores and their relative unreliability, together with the fact that all of these changes were in the predicted direction, they tend to strongly support the impression that a decrease in F scale scores represents increased identification with other blacks. Thus as black officers became less authoritarian they tended to disagree that blacks often encourage other blacks to ridicule the police ($r=-.27$, $p=.13$),

they felt less strongly that blacks are more likely to become involved in criminal activity ($r = -.23$, $p = .20$), they now felt that a black, community controlled, police force was important ($r = .28$, $p = .11$) and they agreed more that blacks work hard ($r = .26$, $p = .16$).

Thus, the picture that began to emerge is that young blacks, upon entering the academy, often have adopted what they perceive to be the prejudices and conservatism of the white majority but that as hostility increases over the racial problems which are perceived within the department, both in terms of black-white frictions and perceived white favoritism, they become angrier with whites and reject their previous identification with the white establishment. This results in a sudden drop in authoritarianism and in prejudice towards minorities along with a cynical rejection of the white police association which they now feel does not operate in their best interests. Similar findings of a relationship between negativism towards whites and an increase in positive feelings about their own race, by blacks, have been reported by the present investigator in other settings (Teahan and Hug, 1969; Teahan and Podany, 1971).

The increased willingness on the part of black officers (as well as white) to acknowledge the greater participation of blacks in criminal behavior (regardless of the reasons for these crime statistics) is similar to findings reported by Kephart (1957) who found that his sample of black officers in Philadelphia were both embarrassed by and angry about what they felt to be a disproportionately high level of crime among lower socioeconomic blacks. Even though they were often aware of the social conditions that bred crime they were still concerned about the Negro crime rate, especially because they felt it reflected on them as blacks. Kephart even suggested that these officers sometimes dealt even more

harshly with black suspects, than did white officers, because of this concern that it placed them in a bad light.

One might wonder whether some of the apparent inconsistencies found in the test results of black officers might be related to this. Are black officers plagued with ambivalent feelings regarding their job and their identification with blacks? For example, one finds them agreeing even more strongly than ever, after being involved in regular police work, with the statement that police may be guilty of physical and verbal abuse of citizens (in contrast with white officers who disagree more with this statement after leaving the academy). At the same time they tend to agree more than they did when they entered the academy, with the belief that reports of brutality and harrassment by police are often due to misinformation and misunderstanding. They also, like their white counterparts, reveal a slight but continual shift, over time, in the direction of more negative feelings towards blacks, although this change and level is certainly not as great as that shown by white officers, and, of course, they are still markedly more positive in their feelings than the latter. However, this same movement, in a negative direction, can also be seen in their stronger tendency, since the academy, to feel that blacks do not work hard. They also tend to disagree, even more than white officers, with the importance of an environmental role on crime. All of this does suggest the presence of mixed feelings, on their part, with respect to their perception of other blacks. Perhaps this might also explain their insistence that the police really want to understand black people, in contrast to white officers who gave even less lip service than ever to this sentiment since graduation. The even stronger insistence, by black officers, that black people want more police protection (in contrast to

white police who claim the opposite) may also again reflect the pressures which these officers feel in terms of being caught between an ambivalent identification with the police, on the one hand, and black people on the other as they try to justify their shifting loyalties. As will be discussed later, placing black officers in white precincts without much peer support may intensify this conflict even more and may force upon them even stronger identification with the perceived white majority position.

Certainly, it has been clear thus far that not only are there major differences between black and white officers in terms of their perceptions of departmental racial problems, but that these officers change markedly from the time they enter the academy until they have been involved in regular police work for at least a year. However, important differences in other less racially oriented values also characterize black and white officers and, contrary to the opinions of some authorities (Lipset, 1969; Kephart, 1957; Rokeach, 1971) there is ample evidence that police work does have an impact on, and change, these value orientations.

Some of the original value differences between black and white cadets are similar to Rokeach's (1971) findings. For example, he too found his sample of white police placing greater emphasis on "an exciting life," although his officers ranked this far lower in their hierarchy than did the present group of white cadets (a rank of 15th versus a rank of 9th). He was, of course, also comparing white police to white and black non-police while the present study found these consistent differences, even after eighteen months of duty, between *black* and *white police*. It may be that a yearning for excitement plays less of a role in bringing blacks into the force. "Logical" and "a sense of accomplishment" were also given more importance by white than black police cadets. This too agrees

with Rokeach's white police-black civilian differences. However, he felt that this represented the values characteristic of police alone, since his sample of white, non-police also rated "logical" as less important. Rokeach interpreted this finding as reflecting a need within police to feel relatively impersonal because of the rule-oriented and authority-dominated bureaucratic structure in which they operated.

In the present study these similar black-white differences might at first appear to be due to socioeconomic or cultural differences since they were found between black and white *police* and not between police and civilians. This explanation is somewhat supported by the finding that whites initially rated "clean" as far less important than blacks. This value has been found by Rokeach (private communication) to be most sensitive to socioeconomic influence since middle class persons take cleanliness for granted, while lower class persons, living under disadvantageous conditions, must struggle to maintain a moderate level of cleanliness in their surroundings. Thus there is evidence that the black and white officers in this study came from different socioeconomic backgrounds. Perhaps this might also account for the differences already reported on "exciting life" since blacks may have entered the force primarily to upgrade themselves socioeconomically while whites joined primarily for other reasons, such as escape from boredom.

It is when we examine the shifts that take place over the next year and a half, however, that we see further support for Rokeach's conjecture. Thus we see black and white officers significantly shifting and converging in terms of an increased emphasis on "intellectual" and "logical" while decreasing their interest in more softer affective values such as "forgiving," "helpful" and "loving." In addition, it is interesting to

note that "clean" no longer differentiates blacks from whites which suggests that it may be highly sensitive to the upgraded economic conditions which the police department has given to some black officers. One thus begins to see the formation of impersonal, detached attitudes among officers with a corresponding lessening in what could be thought of as more softer, empathic and humanistic values in their orientation to the world.

Other changes which have taken place in officers since they entered the academy, further suggest that they are changing in many directions which are not at all compatible with the ideal of changing the image of the police officer from that of a mere law enforcer of the traditional western sheriff model, to that of a more socially concerned, human relations oriented professional. Thus, not only do white officers become less interested in equality-brotherhood, but both black and white officers shift in terms of placing greater importance on "a comfortable life" and "pleasure" while showing a trend in the direction of having less interest in social values such as "national security," "a world at peace" and "a world of beauty." Admittedly, the latter two values only approached the level required for statistical significance, but the overall impression of changes is strongly suggestive of an increasing self-centered, hedonistic orientation among all officers from the time they enter the academy up until they become involved in regular police duties.

Along with these findings is the very strong rejection of "obedience" and "polite" by all officers, especially on the former value. Most of the shifts on these took place during academy training, although the values remained at the same level following eighteen months of duty. One might suspect that it initially represented a reaction to the very discipline-oriented academy life which is very similar to a traditional army boot-camp.

It should be noted that these changes are very similar to those reported by Bayley and Mendelsohn (1969) who found that patrolmen were far less in favor of strict supervision after they had left the academy than they were prior to this. At any rate, these changes in terms of reacting against authority and external social demands for conformity, along with the greater hedonism and intellectual detachment already reported, as well as the corresponding decrease in softer, empathic values such as helpfulness and forgiveness, all seem to run contrary to the expressed ideals of such police authorities as O. W. Wilson (see Deutsch, 1954). He has stressed the need for greater professionalism among police with special emphasis on the concern that officers should, more and more, become experts in dealing with social problems.

Finally, of some interest in comparing the present initial test results to those of Rokeach, is an apparent difference in terms of the importance assigned to "a world at peace." While he found police rating this value as second and black civilians rating it first, in the present study it was initially ranked sixth and seventh by blacks and whites respectively. Since his data was gathered during the time that civil unrest was sweeping through the ghettos of many Michigan cities, as well as through the entire country, this difference may reflect the concerns of that time. It might also be noted that this value decreased even more in importance, over time, for all officers in the present study, which again underscores the fact that Rokeach's values may be very sensitive to situational and external pressures which may be quite temporary in nature.

Summary

A number of issues seem to have received strong support from the data. First is the fact that police experience does appear to have a strong impact on the values and attitudes of officers. There was clear evidence of radical changes in racial animosity between black and white officers from the time they entered the academy until eighteen months later. Whites had become increasingly more prejudiced towards blacks, especially after graduating from the academy, and blacks had become more negative towards whites. All officers also seemed to become more hedonistic, as well as more impersonal and detached, in their orientation towards the world. Along with this was what seemed to be a decrease in empathy, helpfulness and social concern. Officers also seemed more hostile towards authority figures, perhaps in reaction to the militaristic structure of the department.

There was also some evidence that black officers may enter the academy with a fairly strong identification with what they perceive to be the values of the white power structure. This may result in some ambivalence in their feelings towards other blacks. However, as they progress through the academy and into regular police work, they become increasingly more negative towards whites and disillusioned with the department and begin to shift in the direction of a greater sense of black unity and, unfortunately, in the direction of greater polarity against whites. Thus, while blacks see greater preference being given to whites, white officers perceive the converse with the result that they too become more ethnocentric and polarized.

There is, therefore, little evidence that police experience molds men in the direction that most authorities would prefer, i.e. in terms of

greater professionalism, social concern and better relationships between the races. It is impossible to determine, at this time, whether the increased racial animosity and polarization seen between black and white officers is limited to the city in which this study was conducted. However, the chances are likely that it represents the shifting power struggles taking place in all urban centers where greater numbers of blacks are making more and more demands for change and where their very presence may represent an economic and competitive threat to whites who formerly have had the field fairly much to themselves.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECT OF PRECINCT ASSIGNMENT ON ATTITUDES AND VALUES

One recurring sentiment, expressed primarily by white officers during this project, was the belief that assignment to certain precincts had a pronounced impact on the formation of negative attitudes towards blacks. These men would even claim that officers were treated with respect in primarily white precincts but with hostility and contempt in black precincts. In addition, they complained that the very high percentage of crime in black precincts was bound to have an effect on their perception of blacks. For these reasons a breakdown was done on precincts in terms of the estimated percentage of blacks living within them. For purposes of analysis they were grouped into four categories--those which were (i) primarily white (ii) mildly black (iii) moderately black (iv) extremely black. An analysis of variance on post-test scores was made for all white officers using the four precinct assignment categories as independent factors.

Results

Precinct Analysis

Table XXXI shows this analysis for white officers on the Terminal value scale. It reveals that officers in white precincts valued "a comfortable life" significantly more highly than officers at all other

TABLE XXXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK

PRECINCTS FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON TERMINAL

VALUES

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,126
A comfortable life	1. White (N=9)	3.00	4.27**
	2. Mildly black (N=53)	9.26	
	3. Moderately (N=30)	8.83	
	4. Black (N=38)	8.50	
An exciting life	1. White	7.89	.54
	2. Mildly black	9.17	
	3. Moderately	8.77	
	4. Black	10.00	
A sense of accomplishment	1. White	6.22	.26
	2. Mildly black	6.26	
	3. Moderately	6.80	
	4. Black	5.87	
A world at peace	1. White	9.55	.50
	2. Mildly black	9.94	
	3. Moderately	8.47	
	4. Black	9.08	
A world of beauty	1. White	14.11	.99
	2. Mildly black	14.35	
	3. Moderately	13.53	
	4. Black	14.81	
Equality	1. White	15.44	1.39
	2. Mildly black	12.28	
	3. Moderately	12.30	
	4. Black	11.87	
Family security	1. White	3.44	1.79
	2. Mildly black	4.06	
	3. Moderately	3.53	
	4. Black	5.32	
Freedom	1. White	5.00	1.35
	2. Mildly black	6.68	
	3. Moderately	5.33	
	4. Black	5.32	

TABLE XXXI (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,126
Happiness	1. White	6.55	.25
	2. Mildly black	7.89	
	3. Moderate	7.83	
	4. Black	7.71	
Inner harmony	1. White	10.35	.13
	2. Mildly black	9.75	
	3. Moderate	9.63	
	4. Black	10.18	
Mature love	1. White	9.11	.32
	2. Mildly black	9.77	
	3. Moderate	9.77	
	4. Black	8.97	
National security	1. White	14.67	2.45
	2. Mildly black	10.96	
	3. Moderate	9.67	
	4. Black	10.39	
Pleasure	1. White	7.78	3.47*
	2. Mildly black	11.66	
	3. Moderate	12.13	
	4. Black	12.13	
Salvation	1. White	15.33	.41
	2. Mildly black	13.32	
	3. Moderate	13.33	
	4. Black	13.60	
Self-respect	1. White	7.89	.62
	2. Mildly black	6.85	
	3. Moderate	6.03	
	4. Black	6.29	
Social recognition	1. White	11.89	2.96*
	2. Mildly black	12.17	
	3. Moderate	14.80	
	4. Black	12.00	
True friendship	1. White	11.33	2.11
	2. Mildly black	9.32	
	3. Moderate	11.23	
	4. Black	10.95	

TABLE XXXI (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,126
Wisdom	1. White	11.44	3.14*
	2. Mildly black	7.28	
	3. Moderate	9.00	
	4. Black	8.03	

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

precincts ($F=4.27$, $p=.05$). Perhaps related to this was the greater importance these same officers placed on "pleasure" ($F=3.47$, $p=.05$). They also gave less value to "wisdom" ($F=3.14$, $p=.05$) than officers at blacker precincts. The impression gained is that officers in white precincts are the most hedonistically oriented and, contrary to the opinions of many officers, they show no less prejudice towards blacks. Instead, results, if anything, were in the opposite direction. Thus they gave the lowest ranking to "equality" when compared to other precincts, although the obtained F of 1.39 fails to reach the level required for statistical significance.

It is difficult to interpret the only other significant difference obtained on terminal values--namely, on "social recognition." This seemed entirely due to the lack of interest shown towards this value by officers in moderately black precincts, and there were no clear cut progressions in any direction from white to black precincts.

Table XXXII, which shows the results obtained on Instrumental Values, reveals that officers in white precincts also rate "cheerful" as significantly more important in their lives than do other officers ($F=5.47$, $p=.05$). The results for "broadminded" are again difficult to interpret because both all-white and all-black precincts rate this value highly while mixed precincts show less interest in it ($F=3.28$, $p=.05$). However, a clear trend does appear for "obedient" with officers in white precincts rating it as far less important than officers in more black precincts ($F=5.68$, $p=.01$). There was also a tendency for these same white precinct officers to rate "helpful" as less important, although the obtained F of 2.05 does not reach the level required for statistical significance.

Very few significant differences were found on the other attitude measures. Table XXXIV reveals that it is only with respect to reported

contact with blacks that officers from white precincts differ, and predictably they report the least social contact with blacks when compared to officers at all blacker precincts ($F=2.67$, $p=.05$).

Although no other significant differences appeared there were some slight trends and, for example, on ethnocentrism towards blacks (E Scale), feelings towards blacks (Variable 4) and concern about police-community relations (Variable 19), there was a progressive decrease in negative feelings, or prejudice towards blacks, from white to black precincts. Since these trends were not statistically significant they can only be considered suggestive, however.

A similar analysis for black officers also revealed some interesting differences when using this same precinct grouping. Table XXXV reveals that black officers in white precincts are significantly more concerned about "family security" and "salvation" than are black officers in black precincts ($F=3.14$, $p=.05$; and $F=3.95$, $p=.05$, respectively). It is difficult to interpret the differences on "world of beauty" ($F=2.97$, $p=.05$) and "happiness" ($F=3.39$, $p=.05$) since there were no really consistent trends from black to white precincts. The significant differences seemed entirely due to the low value placed on "a world of beauty" and the high value placed on "happiness" by black officers in mildly black precincts only.

Only one significant difference on Instrumental Values can be found in Table XXXVI and that was on "polite," with black officers at white precincts showing greatest concern for this value ($F=3.40$, $p=.05$). It is interesting to note that this same trend was true for white officers in Table XXXIII although, there, the obtained difference between white and black precincts failed to reach the level required for statistical

TABLE XXXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK
PRECINCTS FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON INSTRUMENTAL
VALUES

	Precinct	Means	F.ratios df 3,126
Ambitious	1. White	4.67	.92
	2. Mildly black	6.40	
	3. Moderate	7.37	
	4. Black	6.13	
Broadminded	1. White	6.00	3.28*
	2. Mildly black	9.32	
	3. Moderate	9.47	
	4. Black	6.95	
Capable	1. White	6.44	1.62
	2. Mildly black	7.55	
	3. Moderate	8.97	
	4. Black	6.63	
Cheerful	1. White	8.78	3.47*
	2. Mildly black	12.38	
	3. Moderate	14.07	
	4. Black	13.34	
Clean	1. White	10.22	.20
	2. Mildly black	9.53	
	3. Moderate	9.13	
	4. Black	9.89	
Courageous	1. White	9.89	.29
	2. Mildly black	8.30	
	3. Moderate	8.50	
	4. Black	8.68	
Forgiving	1. White	13.44	.24
	2. Mildly black	13.40	
	3. Moderate	12.57	
	4. Black	13.29	
Helpful	1. White	13.55	2.05
	2. Mildly black	11.13	
	3. Moderate	11.57	
	4. Black	9.71	

TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,126
Honest	1. White	5.00	1.50
	2. Mildly black	3.30	
	3. Moderate	5.00	
	4. Black	3.97	
Imaginative	1. White	11.78	1.67
	2. Mildly black	12.02	
	3. Moderate	13.97	
	4. Black	12.42	
Independent	1. White	7.78	.47
	2. Mildly black	9.81	
	3. Moderate	10.10	
	4. Black	9.92	
Intellectual	1. White	9.55	.86
	2. Mildly black	9.38	
	3. Moderate	11.13	
	4. Black	10.39	
Logical	1. White	11.44	1.25
	2. Mildly black	9.13	
	3. Moderate	8.47	
	4. Black	8.55	
Loving	1. White	11.44	1.00
	2. Mildly black	9.13	
	3. Moderate	9.97	
	4. Black	11.76	
Obedient	1. White	14.67	5.68**
	2. Mildly black	12.83	
	3. Moderate	9.23	
	4. Black	11.79	
Polite	1. White	10.11	1.41
	2. Mildly black	11.26	
	3. Moderate	10.47	
	4. Black	12.39	
Responsible	1. White	8.00	1.28
	2. Mildly black	6.17	
	3. Moderate	5.17	
	4. Black	6.53	

TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,126
Self-controlled	1. White	7.67	1.42
	2. Mildly black	7.70	
	3. Moderate	6.30	
	4. Black	8.66	

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

TABLE XXXIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK PRECINCTS
FOR WHITE OFFICERS ON THE CALIFORNIA F AND E SCALES
AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

	Precincts	Means	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:			
F Scale	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	85.00 86.71 90.57 82.71	1.21
Ethnocentrism Negroes	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	28.33 28.24 27.79 26.18	.37
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	18.33 19.58 19.13 17.84	.75
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (1, 10, 11)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	8.67 8.07 6.47 8.29	.30
2. Rating of relations between whites and police (2, 12, 13)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	4.67 4.79 5.03 5.55	2.14
3. Rating of relations between white and black police (3, 8, 9)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	7.33 6.85 6.93 7.47	.70
4. Your feelings about blacks (4, 6)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	5.78 5.41 5.63 5.00	.29

TABLE XXXIII (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios
5. Your feelings about whites (5, 7)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	4.56 4.06 4.60 4.42	1.31
6. Black police get preferred treatment (14)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	6.22 6.28 6.37 5.92	.70
7. White police get preferred treatment (15)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	9.67 9.58 9.00 9.63	1.15
8. Are black police equal professionals (16, 19)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	4.22 4.49 4.40 4.74	.32
9. Amount of black contact (17)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	6.67 7.41 6.20 7.79	2.67*
10. Amount of white contact (18)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	10.56 10.94 10.20 11.68	1.48
11. Police want to understand blacks (20)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	3.11 2.96 2.83 2.66	
12. Police guilty of abuse (21)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	2.22 2.00 2.30 2.26	.77
13. Blacks laugh at police (22)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	2.22 1.90 1.53 1.60	2.25

TABLE XXXIII (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios
14. Blacks are most criminal (23, 30)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	5.67 6.32 6.26 6.05	.30
15. Poverty and crime caused (24, 25)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	5.22 4.85 4.93 5.10	.20
16. Community controlled police (26)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	3.89 4.41 4.33 4.26	.62
17. Separate police-community relations (27)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	3.67 3.72 3.57 3.87	.40
18. Blacks assumed guilty (28)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	2.56 3.08 2.63 2.84	1.14
19. Police-community relations important (29)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	2.89 2.13 2.03 1.76	2.56
20. Name calling by police bad (31)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	1.67 1.92 1.80 1.79	.33
21. Blacks want more police (32)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	2.00 1.87 2.33 1.87	1.32
22. Blacks work hard (33)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderate 4. Black	3.33 3.15 2.93 2.82	.82

TABLE XXXIII (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios
23. Two separate police unions is good (34)	1. White	3.78	1.24
	2. Mildly black	4.23	
	3. Moderate	4.07	
	4. Black	4.50	
24. Police brutality is exaggerated (35)	1. White	1.56	.21
	2. Mildly black	1.58	
	3. Moderate	1.50	
	4. Black	1.66	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XXXIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK

PRECINCTS FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON TERMINAL

VALUES

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,51
A comfortable life	1. White (N=5)	4.80	1.13
	2. Mildly black (N=16)	6.38	
	3. Moderately (N=10)	7.70	
	4. Black (N=24)	8.21	
An exciting life	1. White	11.60	.31
	2. Mildly black	10.56	
	3. Moderately	12.50	
	4. Black	11.36	
A sense of accomplishment	1. White	7.40	.19
	2. Mildly black	6.62	
	3. Moderately	7.80	
	4. Black	7.17	
A world at peace	1. White	9.80	.29
	2. Mildly black	10.38	
	3. Moderately	8.30	
	4. Black	9.50	
A world of beauty	1. White	12.40	2.97*
	2. Mildly black	16.12	
	3. Moderately	13.20	
	4. Black	13.42	
Equality	1. White	4.80	.71
	2. Mildly black	6.12	
	3. Moderately	3.70	
	4. Black	5.71	
Family security	1. White	2.60	3.14*
	2. Mildly black	4.25	
	3. Moderately	3.50	
	4. Black	6.71	
Freedom	1. White	7.60	.74
	2. Mildly black	5.00	
	3. Moderately	5.00	
	4. Black	4.67	

TABLE XXXIV (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,51
Happiness	1. White	9.20	3.39*
	2. Mildly black	4.94	
	3. Moderately	6.80	
	4. Black	8.29	
Inner harmony	1. White	11.80	.54
	2. Mildly black	9.81	
	3. Moderately	9.10	
	4. Black	9.46	
Mature love	1. White	10.20	1.57
	2. Mildly black	11.44	
	3. Moderately	13.00	
	4. Black	9.71	
National security	1. White	12.00	.14
	2. Mildly black	13.31	
	3. Moderately	13.60	
	4. Black	12.88	
Pleasure	1. White	13.40	.31
	2. Mildly black	12.19	
	3. Moderately	13.20	
	4. Black	12.08	
Salvation	1. White	7.20	3.95*
	2. Mildly black	15.12	
	3. Moderately	15.20	
	4. Black	12.96	
Self-respect	1. White	6.60	.36
	2. Mildly black	6.12	
	3. Moderately	7.40	
	4. Black	6.33	
Social recognition	1. White	14.60	1.18
	2. Mildly black	13.44	
	3. Moderately	12.10	
	4. Black	11.67	
True friendship	1. White	14.00	1.26
	2. Mildly black	12.50	
	3. Moderately	13.50	
	4. Black	11.38	

TABLE XXXIV (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,51
Wisdom	1. White	9.00	
	2. Mildly black	6.88	1.82
	3. Moderately	5.40	
	4. Black	8.50	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XXXV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK
PRECINCTS FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON INSTRUMENTAL

	VALUES		
	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,51
Ambitious	1. White (N=5)	7.00	
	2. Mildly black (N=16)	5.88	.59
	3. Moderately (N=10)	5.60	
	4. Black (N=24)	7.21	
Broadminded	1. White	8.60	
	2. Mildly black	7.37	1.02
	3. Moderately	8.40	
	4. Black	6.00	
Capable	1. White	8.00	
	2. Mildly black	8.69	.09
	3. Moderately	8.20	
	4. Black	8.92	
Cheerful	1. White	13.20	
	2. Mildly black	12.38	.43
	3. Moderately	14.30	
	4. Black	12.75	
Clean	1. White	7.00	
	2. Mildly black	8.06	1.74
	3. Moderately	12.10	
	4. Black	9.37	
Courageous	1. White	7.20	
	2. Mildly black	10.12	.10
	3. Moderately	9.20	
	4. Black	7.92	
Forgiving	1. White	10.20	
	2. Mildly black	12.12	.25
	3. Moderately	11.80	
	4. Black	11.25	
Helpful	1. White	11.00	
	2. Mildly black	11.44	1.13
	3. Moderately	9.50	
	4. Black	9.21	

TABLE XXXV (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios df 3,51
Honest	1. White	3.40	
	2. Mildly black	5.81	.69
	3. Moderately	4.80	
	4. Black	4.25	
Imaginative	1. White	15.40	
	2. Mildly black	12.88	1.49
	3. Moderately	11.00	
	4. Black	13.35	
Independent	1. White	14.00	
	2. Mildly black	8.88	2.77
	3. Moderately	8.50	
	4. Black	7.21	
Intellectual	1. White	12.20	
	2. Mildly black	9.00	2.08
	3. Moderately	5.90	
	4. Black	9.54	
Logical	1. White	13.80	
	2. Mildly black	11.37	1.54
	3. Moderately	9.40	
	4. Black	9.67	
Loving	1. White	8.00	
	2. Mildly black	12.81	2.20
	3. Moderately	14.90	
	4. Black	13.83	
Obedient	1. White	9.60	
	2. Mildly black	14.56	2.03
	3. Moderately	12.80	
	4. Black	13.58	
Polite	1. White	7.60	
	2. Mildly black	9.50	3.40*
	3. Moderately	12.00	
	4. Black	13.08	
Responsible	1. White	7.20	
	2. Mildly black	5.62	.28
	3. Moderately	5.10	
	4. Black	5.75	

TABLE XXXV (CONTINUED)

	Precinct	Means	F ratios <i>df</i> 3,51
Self-controlled	1. White	7.60	
	2. Mildly black	4.50	2.33
	3. Moderately	7.50	
	4. Black	7.62	

*significant at the .05 level

TABLE XXXVI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF WHITE, MIXED AND BLACK
PRECINCTS FOR BLACK OFFICERS ON THE CALIFORNIA
F AND E SCALES AND ON OTHER QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Social Survey Questions:	Precincts	Means	F ratios df 3,51
F Scale-	1. White (N=9)	78.20	
	2. Mildly black (N=53)	80.75	.15
	3. Moderately (N=30)	76.30	
	4. Black (N=38)	76.67	
Ethnocentrism Negroes	1. Whites	11.80	
	2. Mildly black	13.69	.67
	3. Moderately	11.60	
	4. Black	13.12	
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	1. White	15.60	
	2. Mildly black	17.12	1.14
	3. Moderately	14.60	
	4. Black	13.92	
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Rating of relations between blacks and police (1, 10, 11)	1. White	7.80	
	2. Mildly black	8.06	1.74
	3. Moderately	8.60	
	4. Black	9.17	
2. Ratings of relations between whites and police (2, 12, 13)	1. White	5.00	
	2. Mildly black	5.12	.22
	3. Moderately	4.70	
	4. Black	5.04	
3. Rating of relations between white and black police (3, 8, 9)	1. White	7.60	
	2. Mildly black	8.56	.73
	3. Moderately	9.10	
	4. Black	8.54	
4. Your feelings about blacks (4, 6)	1. White	2.60	
	2. Mildly black	3.19	.25
	3. Moderately	3.10	
	4. Black	3.04	

TABLE XXXVI (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios df 3,51
5. Your feelings about whites (5, 7)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	4.80 4.18 5.60 5.12	2.02
6. Black police get preferred treatment (14)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	9.40 10.06 10.90 9.92	.74
7. White police get preferred treatment (15)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	6.60 5.75 5.30 5.21	1.04
8. Are black police equal professionals (16, 19)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	2.00 2.87 2.70 2.71	.75
9. Amount of black contact (17)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	9.40 11.75 13.20 11.58	2.04
10. Amount of white contact (18)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	6.80 9.87 10.10 7.87	2.09
11. Police want to understand blacks (20)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	2.80 2.62 2.00 2.38	.58
12. Police guilty of abuse (21)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	1.20 1.12 1.20 1.33	.35
13. Blacks laugh at police (22)	1. White 2. Mildly black 3. Moderately 4. Black	2.60 2.25 2.40 2.21	.18
14. Blacks are most criminal (23, 30)	1. White 2. Mildly black	6.40 5.25	.63

TABLE XXXVI (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios df 3,51
	3. Moderately	6.30	
	4. Black	5.96	
15. Poverty and crime caused (24, 25)	1. White	4.60	.40
	2. Mildly black	4.44	
	3. Moderately	5.30	
	4. Black	4.54	
16. Community controlled police (26)	1. White	4.00	1.62
	2. Mildly black	4.12	
	3. Moderately	4.20	
	4. Black	3.42	
17. Separate police-community relations (27)	1. White	2.40	3.44*
	2. Mildly black	3.69	
	3. Moderately	2.60	
	4. Black	3.71	
18. Blacks assumed guilty (28)	1. White	1.60	.93
	2. Mildly black	2.19	
	3. Moderately	2.10	
	4. Black	1.75	
19. Police community relations important (29)	1. White	1.40	.92
	2. Mildly black	1.56	
	3. Moderately	1.50	
	4. Black	1.21	
20. Name calling by police bad (31)	1. White	1.40	.90
	2. Mildly black	1.62	
	3. Moderately	1.40	
	4. Black	1.29	
21. Blacks want more police (32)	1. White	2.20	3.43*
	2. Mildly black	1.56	
	3. Moderately	1.20	
	4. Black	1.21	
22. Blacks work hard (33)	1. White	2.00	4.25*
	2. Mildly black	2.06	
	3. Moderately	1.20	
	4. Black	1.38	
23. Two separate police unions is good (34)	1. White	5.00	1.78
	2. Mildly black	3.88	
	3. Moderately	4.10	
	4. Black	3.54	

TABLE XXXVI (CONTINUED)

	Precincts	Means	F ratios df 3,51
24. Police brutality is exaggerated (35)	1. White	1.80	
	2. Mildly black	2.31	.35
	3. Moderately	2.50	
	4. Black	2.42	

*significant at the .05 level

significance. In addition, the trend for "obedient" is in the opposite direction of that found among white officers in that blacks in white precincts gave this value greatest importance. For white officers, "obedient" was least important in white precincts. However, the obtained F of 2.03 for black officers can still only be thought of as suggestive.

Only a few of the attitude variables showed significant differences in terms of precinct assignments. Table XXXIII shows that black officers in white precincts feel more strongly than their fellow officers in blacker precincts that the police-community relations unit should be separated from the police department (Variable 17, $F=3.44$, $p=.05$). They also tend to disagree that black people work hard (Variable 22, $F=4.25$, $p=.05$) and they dispute the statement that blacks want more police protection than they now have (Variable 21, $F=3.43$, $p=.05$). This suggests that black officers in white precincts may develop more negative attitudes towards blacks, perhaps due to the influence of the predominantly white majority with whom they work.

Interestingly enough, black officers do not report more contact with whites as a result of working in white precincts. Indeed, the trend is in the opposite direction with blacks in white precincts reporting the least social contact with whites ($F=2.09$, $p=.10$). This is in marked contrast to the findings reported for white officers where social contact with blacks progressively and significantly increased as the percentage of black citizens in the precincts increased. There is, therefore, some hint in the present findings that black officers may become more isolated from whites when their duty is in primarily white precincts.

Inter-racial contact and Attitudes

Because of the possible importance of inter-racial interactions on attitudes, correlations were computed between the amount of opposite-race contact reported by officers and their scores on all other measures. Those which reached a level of statistical significance are reported in Table XXXVII. An examination of the correlations found for whites reveal, as suspected, that the more contact with blacks which a white officer reports, the more important he values "equality," ($r = -.24$), "broadminded" ($r = -.23$) and "helpful" ($r = -.19$). He also rates "ambitious" high ($r = -.20$) but "true friendship" low ($r = .18$) in his value hierarchy. In addition, more black contact is related to low authoritarianism ($r = -.18$) and ethnocentrism towards blacks ($r = -.30$) on the California scales. This same white officer also reports better relationships existing between black and police ($r = -.24$), and between black and white police officers ($r = -.24$), than does an officer who reports little black contact. He also rates his own feelings about black people ($r = -.24$) and black police ($r = -.35$) more positively and, for some reason, he reports more contact with whites as well ($r = .18$). However, he tends to disagree that a black, community-controlled police force is a good thing ($r = .24$) and he does not believe that the police-community relations unit should be separated from the department ($r = .24$). In this same vein, he does feel that police community relations are important ($r = -.14$) and he agrees that name calling, by police, adversely affects citizens ($r = -.14$).

There were only a limited number of significant correlations when the amount of contact with whites reported by black officers was correlated with attitude measures. Table XXXVII indicates that if a black officer rates himself as having high social contact with whites, he tends

TABLE XXXVII

SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN REPORT OF OPPOSITE
RACE CONTACT AND VALUE AND ATTITUDE SCORES

White Officers N=143		Black Officers N=61	
Contact with Blacks: and		Contact with whites: and	
equality	-.24**	Inner harmony	.35**
true friendship	.18*	Self-control	.23*
ambition	-.20**		
broadminded	-.23**	Contact with blacks	.56**
helpful	-.19*	Police want understand blacks	-.26*
polite	.18*	Police guilty of abuse	.24*
responsible	.15*	Name calling by police bad	.23*
F Scale	-.18*		
E (Negro) Scale	-.30**		
Rel. blacks and police	-.24**		
Rel. black and white police	-.24**		
You feel about blacks	-.29**		
You feel about black police	-.35**		
Contact with whites	.18*		
Black community control imp.	.24**		
Separate police-comm. relations	.26**		
Police community rel. important	-.16*		
Name calling by police bad	-.14*		

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

to place little value on "inner harmony" ($r=.35$) and "self-control" ($r=.23$). He too reports greater contact with members of his own race if he has more contact with whites ($r=.56$). This is identical to the finding with whites and suggests either a generalized social interest factor or simply a response set in which one tries, to some extent, to equalize the reported amount of contact with one's own and another race. Black officers who reported more interactions with whites also feel that the police desire greater understanding of black people ($r=-.26$). However, they deny that some police have been guilty of physical or verbal abuse ($r=.24$) and they are not as sure as other black officers that name calling is bad and adversely affects citizens ($r=.23$). All in all the results suggest that although whites who report greater black contact have more positive inter-racial attitudes, there is not much evidence to support an identical hypothesis for black officers who report more white contact. Indeed, there is some suggestion that they may actually be more defensive about whites, denying the existence of any problems without necessarily expressing any more positive feelings towards them.

The Ratio of Black to White Officers in Precincts

The findings regarding black-white interactions suggested that perhaps the most important variable operating within any precinct might actually be the ratio of black to white officers in the job setting. As might be expected there tends to be a rather high correlation between the number of black officers in any precinct and the number of black citizens served by that particular precinct. However, since this correlation is far from perfect and since important social interactions are more likely to take place between officers of different races than between officers

and citizens, an attempt was made to examine the relationship between the percentage of black officers within a precinct and the attitudes and values of officers in that job setting.

The percentage of black officers was computed for each of the thirteen precincts within the city. These ranged from a low of 7.63% in one all white precinct to a high of 36.95% in an all black precinct with a median of 15.55%. Correlations were then run between men's precinct percentage scores and all other test results. Those variables which were significant for either black or white officers, or for all officers treated together, are reported in Table XXXVIII.

These results clearly indicate that the number of black officers at any precinct is related to the kinds of attitudes held by officers. Thus, for all officers, placement in a precinct having few black officers is correlated with placing less importance on "equality" ($r = -.16$) and with greater authoritarianism ($r = -.17$) and ethnocentrism towards both Negroes ($r = -.18$) and foreigners ($r = -.17$). In addition these same officers show little concern for "broadminded" ($r = -.18$) or "helpful" ($r = -.20$) as values, although they are more "polite" ($r = .21$) than officers at other blacker precincts. They express more negative feelings towards blacks when asked how they feel, ($r = -.17$) report less contact with blacks ($r = .20$), want to separate police-community relations from the department ($r = .19$) and they tend to feel that the whole area of such activities is unimportant. ($r = -.22$). They deny that blacks want more police protection ($r = -.20$) and instead feel that blacks are lazy and don't work hard ($r = -.21$). "Family security" for some reason also seems to be very important to police at these white precincts in contrast to officers in blacker precincts ($r = .27$) where this value occupies a relatively unimportant place in the value hierarchy.

TABLE XXXVIII
SIGNIFICANT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PERCENTAGE OF BLACK
OFFICERS AT EACH PRECINCT AND DEPENDENT MEASURES
OF BLACK AND WHITE OFFICERS

Variable	All Officers ¹ N=185	Whites N=130	Blacks N=55
Equality	-.16*	-.10	-.03
Family security	.27**	.25**	.27*
Happiness	.10	.07	.23*
Wisdom	-.03	-.16*	.27*
Broadminded	-.18	-.13	-.22
Helpful	-.20**	-.21**	-.16
Polite	.21**	.15*	.32**
F Scale	-.16*	-.19*	-.03
Ethnocentrism Negroes	-.18*	-.13	.09
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	-.17*	-.10	-.14
Your feelings about blacks (4, 6)	-.17*	-.09	.00
White officers get preference (15)	-.16*	.04	-.14
Amount of black contact (17)	.20**	.19*	-.05
Separate police community rel. (27)	.19**	.21**	.25*
Police community rel. important (29)	-.22**	-.19*	-.17
Blacks want more police (32)	-.20**	-.15*	-.24*
Blacks work hard (33)	-.21**	-.11	-.19

TABLE XXXVIII (CONTINUED)

Variable	All Officers ¹ N=185	Whites N=130	Blacks N=55
Two separate police unions good (35)	-.06	.15*	-.35*

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

¹The smaller number of officers in this analysis is due to the fact that some patrolmen did not have precinct assignments but instead were involved in special duty (traffic, vice, morality, special mobile units, etc.).

These results were essentially the same when whites were examined alone, except that some of the ethnocentrism correlations dropped below the level required for statistical significance, although all of these were still strongly in the same direction. Only two new correlations appeared. One was that white officers at white precincts wish more strongly for two separate police associations--one for whites and one for blacks ($r=.15$). The other was that officers at white precincts show little interest in "wisdom" ($r=-.16$). Both of these results are identical to that found in the precinct analysis previously reported.

When black officers were looked at alone, as might be expected, all of the obvious ethnocentrism correlations completely disappeared. Still noted was a great concern on the part of blacks at white precincts for "family security" ($r=.27$), "happiness" ($r=.23$) and "wisdom" ($r=.27$). While the first value is identical to that found among whites, the findings on "wisdom" are entirely opposite. Thus, for some reason, blacks in white precincts seem to value wisdom especially high while white officers in the same setting downgrade its importance.

It is interesting to note that blacks at white precincts are actually most prone to agree that whites received the least preferred treatment in the department ($r=-.14$). This, of course, is in sharp contrast to blacks in black precincts and suggests that, in white precinct settings, the minority black officers may have some ambivalent identification with the majority white opinion. The fact that these same officers show a fairly strong negative attitude towards foreigners ($r=-.14$) might lend further support to this conjecture. They also show the same attitudes towards blacks as their fellow white officers in wanting to separate police-community relations from the department ($r=.25$), they also deny that blacks

want more police protection ($r = -.24$) and they even feel that blacks are lazy and do not work hard ($r = -.19$). Thus, the evidence mounts that these black officers may identify ambivalently with the aggressor when they find themselves outnumbered in all white precincts. The only major difference between them and their white counterparts is that they do *not* want two separate police associations, one for blacks and one for whites ($r = -.35$). Other black officers are pushing for greater segregation, the reader may recall, which could again suggest that blacks in white precincts want to maintain a closer relationship with whites even if this must be obtained at the expense of disparaging blacks. In essence, then, the pressures of being placed in a minority position in a white precinct may lead to a defensive identification with many of the predominant white attitudes and, unfortunately, an ambivalently negative view of one's own race.

Discussion

There is clear evidence in the results that precinct assignment does indeed have a strong impact on the development of certain values and attitudes among officers. However, contrary to the opinion of many white officers, it is duty in white precincts which seems related to the development of more undesirable viewpoints. This is especially true with respect to prejudice towards blacks but includes other attitudes as well, including some related to a more personal-hedonistic versus a less self-centered and more social orientation towards life.

Another thing that the obtained data suggests is that there are probably two important factors operating with respect to the impact of

white precinct duty on attitudes. One has to do with the effect of the public, whom the precinct serves, on the values and attitudes of officers. This is probably reflected most in the analysis of precincts categorized in terms of the predominant race of citizens. The other factor, which seems to be even more important, judging from the present data, concerns the influence of fellow officers on attitudes, especially fellow officers of a different race with whom one shares duty. This, of course, is most clearly revealed by the correlations obtained between the percentage of black officers at a precinct and the dependent measures. Admittedly these two factors cannot be adequately separated because of the fact that black officers tend to be found mainly in black precincts but since somewhat different results were obtained on some variables by these two separate analyses, it may be possible in some cases to identify the source of the variance. At any rate it seems clear that when an officer in an all-white precinct is serving only whites (who are probably of higher socioeconomic status and more influential than poor blacks) and when he is working primarily with white officers, his attitudes are shaped and reinforced by these contacts. The data also suggests that even when a few black officers are placed in a white precinct, they tend to remain isolated and huddled together since they report little white social contact in comparison to black officers in black precincts. This is also supported by the fact that white officers in white precincts also report little black social contact in comparison to their white counterparts in black precincts.

It seems fairly probable that the greater emphasis placed on politeness by both black and white officers, in white precincts, is primarily due to the impact, or expected impact, of the citizens within those

precincts. One would certainly expect a greater demand for tact and certain styles of relating by middle class persons. It is interesting to note, in this respect, that the strength of the relationship is much higher for black officers which suggests that they may be especially cautious about the use of politeness in white precincts.

Also related to this may be the trend showing greater concern by black officers about obedience in this setting, since they may be afraid of upsetting the white power structure either inside or outside of the station house. This same concern for obedience does not apply to white officers who, instead, apparently feel even less concerned with authority in white precincts than they do in blacker precincts. Perhaps this may, in part, be due to the fact that they are more likely to have black supervisors and commanding officers in these latter precincts. Thus they may feel under similar kinds of pressure to that experienced by black officers in white precincts where the power structure is more obviously white. In addition, these same white officers in white precincts also seem more self-serving in their interests and more hedonistic in their life orientation, placing great emphasis on such values as pleasure and a comfortable life. Indeed the significant results and consistent trends of all analyses give the impression that their main acknowledgement to social concerns may be in terms of the surface appearance of politeness while in most other ways their values are more self-seeking when compared to white officers from blacker precincts.

Black officers in white precincts, on the other hand, do not seem to be characterized by the same degree of hedonism as is seen in whites. They do, however, seem to be especially interested in family security and spiritual salvation, in comparison to blacks from black precincts, and it

is difficult to understand why this should be so. Perhaps it reflects their insecurity in what must be a somewhat unfriendly setting. There certainly is some evidence which suggests that they are very concerned about their acceptance by whites, even to the point where they have even adopted some of the perceived majority ethnocentric viewpoints. Thus they express some disparaging attitudes towards black people suggesting, for example, that blacks do not work hard, and they seem more in agreement with their fellow white officers in feeling that black people do not want more police protection. They would also separate the police-community relations unit from the department. There is also some evidence that they try to minimize problems between blacks and whites. These latter are admittedly trends, but one can see some consistent tendencies for blacks in white precincts to deny that white officers receive preferential treatment and to feel that the relationships between blacks and police, or black and white police, are fairly good. Taken alone, these latter two trends would seem to represent a positive finding but, taking into consideration the more negative attitudes expressed towards their own race, it suggests defensiveness. It might therefore seem that the pressures of being in a minority position (from 6 to 10%) in an all-white precinct, may create a tendency to identify with the majority position resulting in ambivalent feelings for members of one's own race.

This latter suggestion receives greater support when we examine more directly the relationship between attitudes and the percentage of black versus white officers in precincts. White officers in precincts with few black officers are clearly more prejudiced towards blacks and foreigners, more authoritarian in their philosophy and more disparaging of blacks on most of the attitude measures. They predictably downgrade

the importance of police-community relations. However, what is even more startling is the fact that black officers at these precincts have attitudes which are essentially in the same direction, with the one exception that they are not as authoritarian or as blatantly negative towards blacks. Thus they do not receive higher scores than other black officers on the California E (Negro) scale nor do they openly rate themselves as liking blacks less. However, they do tend to disparage foreigners, like their fellow whites in the same precinct, and, as mentioned previously, they tend to agree with white officers that blacks do not work hard and do not really want more police protection. They also play down the importance of police-community relations and they even feel that black officers receive preferential treatment over whites within the department. This is in direct contrast to the views held by a majority of black officers who mostly work out of black precincts.

In addition, all officers at precincts with few black officers show less interest in helpfulness and broadminded as important values which suggests that they do not perceive the police officer's role in these terms. Again, as with the previous analysis, family security is also found to be a more important value in these precincts, and this appears for both black and white officers. This may simply represent a concern for personal welfare and perhaps economic security and it may fit in with the overall self-seeking concerns mentioned previously in discussing white precincts. Finally, and perhaps most ironically, is the one item on which these black and white officers disagree most--namely, on the issue of whether there should be one or two police associations for black and white officers. White officers at these precincts apparently favor segregation and are more inclined to feel that two associations is the best solution,

while the black officers prefer just one organization. This, of course, is in great contrast to blacks in precincts having many black officers. who are now militantly demanding a separate union for black officers as the best way for their interests to be met.

The tendency of a minority group in a position of weakness to identify with the attitudes held by the majority, even when this might not be in its best self-interest, was first reported by Bettelheim (1943) in his study of Jews during their internment in Nazi concentration camps. Bettelheim referred to this as "identification with the aggressor." Through this process of identification, in which the person hopes to reduce his feelings of powerlessness in a magical fashion, hostility towards the aggressor is turned towards the self, or others like oneself, with a resulting loss in self-esteem. Studies by the Clarks (1947, 1950), Landreth and Johnson (1953), Mann (1958) and others all reflect the results of this. Unfortunately, as this process begins to reverse itself, there is also evidence that increased hostility towards whites is the first step in the development of a more positive self-concept as previous identifications are rejected (Teahan and Hug, 1969; Teahan and Podany, 1970). Some of the viewpoints found among black officers regarding separate police associations and the demand for scout car partners of the same race, may reflect this to some extent.

At any rate, while there is some evidence that the direct or indirect impact created by citizens within a precinct may affect ~~officers~~, the conclusion seems clear that of even greater importance in the attitude formation of police is the amount of contact these men have with peers of the opposite race. This would agree with findings from past group dynamics research (Festinger, Schachter and Back, 1968; Homans, 1961). The amount

of social contact with blacks, by whites, as might be expected is strongly related to the number of black officers working in the precinct rather than to the racial composition of the precinct citizens. If social contact is to take place it seems most likely that it would be between fellow workers rather than between police and citizens within the precinct. This contact also likely occurs without coercion--i.e. all of the activities measured dealt with functions such as attending parties, eating in restaurants, participating in sporting events, etc. Of course, some of this might take place during duty hours as, for example, when two scout car partners eat together. However, even here the circumstances that bring the officers together are not imposed by one, on the other, but instead are due to the action of some outside authority. In addition, even more important is the fact that they are working together towards a mutually shared goal--in some cases even protecting each other's life. As Amir (1969) suggests, improved relationships in cases of increased inter-racial contact only appear to take place when such contact is not perceived to be to the disadvantage of one group. Increased contact where there is no mutual concern or shared goal can even generate greater racial animosity (Sherif, 1966; Kramer, 1950; Winder, 1952).

As expected, we find rather similar positive relationships between both reported inter-racial social contact and/or the percentage of black peers in a precinct and such attitudes as prejudice, helpfulness, equality, broadmindedness, etc. We find that officers who report greater social contact with blacks, or who work in precincts with greater numbers of black officers, are less authoritarian and less prejudiced towards blacks on almost all major attitude measures. They also perceive better attitudes existing between both black people and the police, as well as between

black and white police. They support police-community relations, feel that name calling by police is bad and, all in all, show far greater social sensitivity than white officers in white precincts. Interestingly enough, these same officers want to keep the police-community relations unit within the department and they would not favor two separate police unions--one for blacks and one for whites. Thus they want to maintain an integrated force and are not in favor of any form of separatism. In contrast, whites in white precincts, or those with few black contacts, seem more in agreement with greater segregation.

While reported social contact with blacks seems related to many important attitudes among white officers, the same conclusion cannot be made with respect to reported white contact on the part of black officers. Blacks who reported little white contact were found to rate inner harmony and self-control as very important values in their lives. It is difficult to know quite what this means. One could interpret it as indicating that black officers with few white social contacts are more concerned about feelings of subjective unrest and their capacity for self-restraint. One could then suggest that this was due to stronger feelings of resentment since these same officers are found to be more critical of the department, feeling both that police do not want to understand blacks and that they are likely to be guilty of physical and verbal abuse. However, one other thing that must be taken into consideration is the greater tendency among blacks to equalize the amount of reported social contact with whites and blacks. Thus while the correlation among whites for these two variables was only .18, among blacks it was .56. It may well be then that blacks are even more defensive about inter-racial contact than are whites and that if they report social activities with blacks they

also tend to report a similar amount with whites. Whites, on the other hand, feel no such need to equalize their same-race, opposite-race social contact. It may also be that black officers who report little interaction with whites may represent a more seclusive, less sociable group and perhaps these intercorrelations cannot be interpreted in the same way for both races. The only thing that is clear is that reported white contact is not related to the same positive attitudes among blacks that one finds when black contact among whites is examined.

There does, however, seem to be considerable evidence that one of the worst experiences for a white officer is to have constant duty in a white precinct where little contact with black officers takes place. This more segregated duty seems to allow racial stereotypes to build up without much correction and there is evidence that suggests that these officers also drift into rather self-serving complacency. It must also be admitted, of course, that a possibility exists that those officers who are only interested in routine and rather quiet duty ask for, and finally obtain duty in these white outposts where they can wait for their retirement. The investigator has heard comments made about some precincts being refuges for men of this sort. However, police officials deny that this can take place except in rare exceptions where an agreement is unofficially reached between a man and a precinct commander who wants him. They also insist that this holds true only for men who have been on the force for a large number of years, perhaps more than ten, who now have enough "contacts" to be able to obtain some special favors. The majority of men, however, receive whatever assignments are made on the basis of chance and that they have no control over their placement. Since even the veterans used in this study were men who had an average of five or six years experience

(most older men were excluded from the sample) and especially because a great number of men had only eighteen months of police experience, it seems unlikely that the obtained results are just due to a high loading of "semi-retired" officers in the white precinct sample. What we may be seeing instead is the influence that this latter group of men have on the attitudes of all other officers assigned to these outpost precincts.

In a similar vein, apparently the worst thing that can happen to a black officer is to place him in an all-white precinct for an extended period of time. In this setting he apparently feels isolated from other blacks and gradually begins to ambivalently adopt some of the subtle negative racial attitudes of the majority. His great need for acceptance by the majority, however, is reflected in his wish for one integrated police union which runs counter to both the feeling of the white officers in these white precincts and other black officers within the force. One would anticipate that this must create considerable inner conflict within these men.

All in all, then, the present data suggests that rotation among precincts may be the safest policy for the department to adopt with respect to both black and white officers. The racial isolation involved in working in all-white precincts allows stereotypes and myths to grow without the necessary correcting influence of reality. It also places too much strain on minority group members who may attempt to improve their relationships with white officers by using essentially self-defeating mechanisms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adlerman, N. *Treating the troubled family in New York*. New York: Basic, 1966.
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, Levinson, D. J. and Sanford, R. N. *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Alex, N. *Black in blue, a study of the Negro policeman*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.
- Allport, G. W. *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Allport, G. W. and Kramer, B. M. Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology*, 1946, 22, 9-39.
- Amir, Y. Contact hypotheses in ethnic relations. *Psychology Bulletin*, 1969, 71, 5, 319-342.
- Bard, M. and Zacker, J. Design for conflict resolution. Paper presented at the 3rd National Symposium on Law Enforcement, Science and Technology. Chicago, Illinois. April, 1970.
- Bayley, D. H. and Mendelsohn, H. *Minorities and the police: Confrontations in America*. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Bettelheim, B. Individual and mass behavior in extreme situations. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1943, XXXVII, 417-452.
- Clark, K. B. and Clark, M. P. Racial identification and preference in Negro children. In Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley (Eds.) *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt and Co., 1947, 169-178.
- Cook, S. W. Desegregation: A psychological analysis, In W. W. Charters, Jr., and N. L. Gage (Eds.), *Readings in the social psychology of education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1963.
- Culbertson, F. Modification of an emotionally held attitude through role playing. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1965, 65, 279-292.
- Deutsch, A. *The trouble with cops*. New York: Crown, 1955.
- Eisenberg, T. Project PACE: Police and community enterprise. American Institute for Research, Performance Statement, 1970.

- Farber, I. E. The things that people say to themselves. *American Psychologist*, 1963, 18, 185-197.
- Festinger, L. and Carlsmith, J. Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1959, 58, 203-210.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S. and Back, K. Operation of group standards. In O. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.) *Group dynamics*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1968.
- Guthrie, C. R. Law enforcement and the juvenile: A study of police interaction with delinquents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Public Administration, The University of Southern California, 1963.
- Haley, J. Beginning and experienced family therapists. In A. Ferber, M. Mendelsohn, and A. Napier. *The book of family therapy*. Science House, 1972.
- Homans, G. C. *Social behavior: It's elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.
- Janis, I. and King, B. The influence of role playing on opinion change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1954, 49, 211-218.
- Janis, I. and Mann, L. Effectiveness of emotional role playing in modifying smoking habits and attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Research in Psychology*, 1965, 1, 84-92.
- Kelly, R. M. On improving police-community relations: Findings from the conduct and evaluation of an OEO-funded experiment in Washington, D.C. Research Report, American Institute for Research, 1972.
- Kephart, W. M. *Racial factors and urban law enforcement*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1957.
- Kramer, B. M. Residential contact as a determinant of attitudes toward Negroes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Harvard College Library, 1950.
- Landreth, C. and Johnson, B. C. Young children's responses to a picture and insert test designed to reveal reactions to persons of different skin color. *Child Development*, 1953, 24, 63-80.
- Lipset, S. M. Why cops hate liberals--and vice versa. *The Atlantic*, 1969, 223, 3, 76-83.
- Mann, J. H. The influence of racial prejudice on sociometric scores and perceptions. *Sociometry*, 1958, 21, 150-158.
- McClelland, D. C. *Studies in motivation*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955.

- McNamara, J. H. Uncertainties in police work: The relevance of police recruits' backgrounds and training. In David Bordua (Ed.) *The police: Six sociological essays*. New York: Wiley, 1967, 163-252.
- Mendelsohn, R. A. The police interpretation of the Detroit riot of 1967. Paper presented at the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Chicago, 1969.
- Niederhoffer, A. *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967.
- Penner, L., Homant, R. and Rokeach, M. Comparison of rank-order and paired comparison methods for measuring value systems. *Perception and Motor Skills*, 1968, 27, 417-418.
- Rokeach, M. Value systems in religion. *Review of Religious Research*, 1969, 11, 3-23.
- Rokeach, M., Miller, M. G. and Snyder, J. A. The value gap between police and policed. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1971, 27, 2, 155-172.
- Sapir, R. A shelter. *Megamot.*, 1951, 3, 8-36.
- Schlenker, E. H. and Bennis, W. G. *Personal and organizational changes through group methods: The laboratory approach*. New York: Wiley, 1965.
- Sherif, M. *Group conflict and cooperation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Teahan, J. E. and Hug, J. Some effects of audio-visual techniques on the aspirational level and self-concept of Negro students. *Journal of Human Relations*, 1969, 17, 2, 291-310.
- Teahan, J. E. and Hug, J. Status threat and white backlash. *Journal of Human Relations*, 1970, 19, 2, 939-947.
- Teahan, J. E. and Podany, E. The effects of films of successful Negroes on racial self-concept. Presented at the annual convention of the Mid-western Psychological Association, 1971, Detroit, Michigan.
- Triandis, H. C. and Malpass, R. S. Studies of black and white interaction in job settings. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1971, 1, 2, 101-117.
- Williams, D. H. The effects of an interracial project upon the attitudes of Negro and white girls within the Y.W.C.A. In Arnold Rose, *Studies in the reduction of prejudice*. Chicago: American Council of Race Relations, 1948.
- Winder, A. E. White attitudes toward Negro-white interaction in an area of changing racial composition. *American Psychologists*, 1952, 7, 330-331.

LETTER INTRODUCING PHASE 2 PROGRAM

Dear Patrolman _____:

The _____ Police Department is beginning a new program which is geared to help patrolmen become more effective in understanding and dealing with people. It is now the feeling of most departments that one of the characteristics of an efficient officer is his ability to step in and deal smoothly with those situations which, if mishandled, could escalate and become even more explosive. It is because the job of the street officer now involves more and more incidents of this nature that we have initiated this program. You have been designated as someone who already has a good record within the department. Since we want men who have already demonstrated the potential for sensitive and efficient police work it is our feeling that you would be well suited for this program. It will consist of six weekly sessions beginning on _____ and will meet at the conference room of the _____ precinct each week for the following six weeks. Each training session will last from 1 PM until 4 PM and will, of course, be considered duty time. Arrangements have already been made with your precinct commander regarding your attendance. We hope you will find the training to be a valuable asset in your future work and we are hopeful that we can count on your cooperation in this venture. Direct any further inquiries to the project coordinator, _____.

Very truly yours,

6

LETTER INTRODUCING PHASE II TESTING PROGRAM

As you may know, the department has been engaged in a special training program over the past year. We are now asking officers from various precincts and assignments to report for a final and important phase of that program. This will take no more than an hour after which you can return to your regular duties. Depending upon your shift and leave days you should select *one* of the following dates and times and report to the precinct conference room designated below.

DATES OF TESTING

I want to thank you in advance for your cooperation and we hope that this will prove to play an important role in our continuing efforts to upgrade the training and professional efficiency of the department.

SOCIAL SURVEY QUESTIONS

This is a study of what the general public thinks about a number of social questions. The only best answer to each statement below is your honest personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly or even angrily with others, and perhaps being uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same way you do. Please mark each statement in the left-hand margin according to your agreement or disagreement as follows:

+1: Slight support,
agreement

+2: Moderate support
agreement

+3: Strong support,
agreement

-1: Slight opposition,
disagreement

-2: Moderate opposition
disagreement

-3: Strong opposition,
disagreement

Thus, if you find yourself strongly supporting or agreeing with a statement, you should put a +3 in the blank beside that statement. If you disagree strongly, then you should put a -3 in the blank, or whatever number *minus* or *plus* that indicates your true feelings.

-
- _____ 1. What youth needs most is strict discipline, rugged determination and the will to work and fight for family and country.
 - _____ 2. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large, the husband ought to have the main say in family matters.
 - _____ 3. The idea that the white race is naturally better is a fairy tale that some people believe in order to make themselves feel more important.

- _____ 4. The many political parties tend to confuse national issues, add to the expense of elections, and raise unnecessary agitation. For this and other reasons, it would be best if all political parties except the two major ones were abolished.
- _____ 5. The real reason for the high unemployment rate among Negroes is that they lack the incentive to really seek work.
- _____ 6. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
- _____ 7. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last 50 years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.
- _____ 8. Now that there is a United Nations, America must be sure that she loses none of her independence and complete power as a sovereign nation.
- _____ 9. Patriotism and loyalty are the first and most important requirements of a good citizen.
- _____ 10. Many Latin American countries will probably never advance to the standards of living and civilization of the United States.
- _____ 11. It would be a mistake to have Negroes for foremen and leaders over whites.
- _____ 12. Certain religious sects whose beliefs do not permit them to salute the flag should be forced to conform to such a patriotic action, or else be abolished.
- _____ 13. America may not be perfect, but the American Way has brought us about as close as human beings can get to a perfect society.
- _____ 14. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.
- _____ 15. Minor forms of military training, obedience, and discipline, such as drill, marching and simple commands, should be made part of the elementary school educational programs.
- _____ 16. Negroes may have a part to play in white civilization, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much intermixing with whites.
- _____ 17. Science has its place, but there are many important things that must always be beyond human understanding.
- _____ 18. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.

- _____ 19. There is something different and strange about many minority groups (such as Chinese, Mexicans, Negroes, Jews); it's hard to tell what they are thinking and planning and what makes them tick.
- _____ 20. The most important qualities of a real man are determination and a driving ambition.
- _____ 21. Any group or social movement which contains many foreigners should be watched with suspicion and, whenever possible, be investigated by the F.B.I.
- _____ 22. The best guarantee of our national security is for America to have the biggest Army and Navy in the world and the secrets of the atom bomb.
- _____ 23. Negroes are too superstitious to ever become great scientists.
- _____ 24. Most of our social problems would be solved if we would somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked people.
- _____ 25. World War II proved that we must be very careful never to trust foreign countries.
- _____ 26. The best teacher or boss is one who tells us just exactly what is to be done and how to go about it.
- _____ 27. Manual labor and menial jobs seem to fit the mentality and ability of most Negroes.
- _____ 28. A woman whose children are at all messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.
- _____ 29. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relation.
- _____ 30. If a child is unusual in any way, his parents should get him to be more like other children.
- _____ 31. The people who raise all the talk about putting non-whites on the same level as whites, and giving them the same privileges, are mostly radical agitators trying to stir up conflicts.
- _____ 32. More than anything else, it is good hard work that makes life worthwhile.
- _____ 33. One main difficulty with allowing the entire population to participate fully in governmental affairs (voting, jobs, etc.) is that a large percentage is by nature unintelligent and incapable.
- _____ 34. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

- _____ 35. World War II proved that the Japanese were war-like and dangerous, and America should always be on its guard and keep foreigners out of the country.
- _____ 36. There will always be wars, because, for one thing, there will always be races who ruthlessly try to grab more than their share.
- _____ 37. Most Negroes would become overbearing and disagreeable if given the chance.
- _____ 38. There will always be superior and inferior nations in the world and in the interests of all concerned, it is best that the superior ones be in control of world affairs.
- _____ 39. The most vicious, irresponsible, and racketeering organizations are, in most cases, those having largely foreigners for leaders.

Below are 35 questions about your perception of your job as a Detroit policeman and your feelings toward fellow policemen and residents in Detroit.

Please answer *every* question carefully. For many of the questions, you may think you know what answer we are looking for. However, please *do not* write down an answer just because you think *we* would like it. We are only interested in *your* point of view.

We want to assure you that your answers to these questions will be treated in the *strictest confidence*. They will be seen by Wayne State staff only and the Police Department will receive summaries only for a group of at least 150 policemen.

1. How would you describe the relationship between the majority of black people and the majority of policemen (check one only)?

- ☐ (a) Very good relationship.
- ☐ (b) Good relationship.
- ☐ (c) Neither good nor poor.
- ☐ (d) Poor relationship.
- ☐ (e) Very poor relationship.

2. How would you describe the relationship between the majority of white people and the majority of policemen (check one only)?

- ☐ (a) Very good relationship.
- ☐ (b) Good relationship.
- ☐ (c) Neither good nor poor.
- ☐ (d) Poor relationship.
- ☐ (e) Very poor relationship.

3. How would you describe the relationship between the majority of black policemen and the majority of white policemen in the Detroit Police Department? (Check one).

- ☐ (a) Very good relationship.
- ☐ (b) Good relationship.
- ☐ (c) Neither good nor poor.
- ☐ (d) Poor relationship.
- ☐ (e) Very poor relationship.

4. How do you *personally* feel about the majority of black people? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) I like them very much.
- ☐ (b) I like them somewhat.
- ☐ (c) I neither like nor dislike them.
- ☐ (d) I dislike them somewhat.
- ☐ (e) I dislike them very much.

5. How do you *personally* feel about the majority of white people? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) I like them very much.

- ☐ (b) I like them somewhat.
- ☐ (c) I neither like nor dislike them.
- ☐ (d) I dislike them somewhat.
- ☐ (e) I dislike them very much.

6. How do you *personally* feel about the majority of black policemen?
(Check one).

- ☐ (a) I like them very much.
- ☐ (b) I like them somewhat.
- ☐ (c) I neither like nor dislike them.
- ☐ (d) I dislike them somewhat.
- ☐ (e) I dislike them very much.

7. How do you *personally* feel about the majority of white policemen?
(Check one)

- ☐ (a) I like them very much.
- ☐ (b) I like them somewhat.
- ☐ (c) I neither like nor dislike them.
- ☐ (d) I dislike them somewhat.
- ☐ (e) I dislike them very much.

8. Do you think that the majority of black policemen like the majority of white policemen? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
- ☐ (b) No.
- ☐ (c) Don't know.

9. Do you think that the majority of white policemen like the majority of black policemen? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
- ☐ (b) No.
- ☐ (c) Don't know.

10. Do you think that the majority of black people like the majority of policemen? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
- ☐ (b) No.
- ☐ (c) Don't know.

11. Do you think that the majority of policemen like the majority of black people? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
- ☐ (b) No.
- ☐ (c) Don't know.

12. Do you think that the majority of white people like the majority of policemen? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
☐ (b) No.
☐ (c) Don't know.

13. Do you think that the majority of policemen like the majority of white people? (Check one).

- ☐ (a) Yes.
☐ (b) No.
☐ (c) Don't know.

14. Do you feel that black policemen receive better, equal, or worse treatment as compared with white policemen in terms of (check one for each of the four categories):

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Equal</u>	<u>Worse</u>
A. Duty Assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Disciplinary Treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Promotions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Entrance Exam Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Do you feel that white policemen receive better, equal, or worse treatment as compared with black policemen in terms of (check one for each of the four categories):

	<u>Better</u>	<u>Equal</u>	<u>Worse</u>
A. Duty Assignments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Disciplinary Treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Promotions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Entrance Exam Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

16. Do you feel that black and white policemen should share radio cars? (Check one)

- ☐ (a) Yes.
☐ (b) No.
☐ (c) Don't know.

17. How often have you invited a black policeman or black civilian to share any of the following activities with you (check one for each of the four categories)?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once/Twice</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very often</u>
A. Snack bar or restaurant	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Participate in a sporting event	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Attend a white party	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Weekend or other off-duty activity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. How often have you invited a white policeman or white civilian to share any of the following activities with you (check one for each of the four categories)?

Never Once/Twice Often Very often

- A. Snack bar or restaurant _____
 B. Participate in a sporting event _____
 C. Attend a black party _____
 D. Weekend or other off-duty activity _____

19. What is your feeling about the following statement? "The black person as a policeman is equal in professionalism to the white policeman."

- _____ (a) I strongly agree.
 _____ (b) I moderately agree.
 _____ (c) I neither agree nor disagree.
 _____ (d) I moderately disagree.
 _____ (e) I strongly disagree.

Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements by writing in the line at the left of the statement the letter *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, or *e*.

a = Strongly Agree *b* = Moderately Agree *c* = Neutral *d* = Moderately Disagree *e* = Strongly Disagree

- _____ 20. Policemen desire a greater understanding of black people.
- _____ 21. Some policemen have been guilty of either physical or verbal abuse of citizens.
- _____ 22. There is pressure exerted on black people by other black people to denounce or make fun of policemen.
- _____ 23. There is a good possibility that a white person standing on a street corner late at night is a criminal.
- _____ 24. Poverty and wealth are primarily determined by geographic location and environmental conditions.
- _____ 25. With a good job, a man can stay away from engaging in criminal activities.
- _____ 26. An all-black community controlled police department is the best solution to the police-black community relations problem.
- _____ 27. The police-community relations unit of the Detroit police department can only do its job by alienating itself from the rest of the police department.
- _____ 28. Black people are often assumed to be guilty of a crime because they commit a disproportionate number of crimes.
- _____ 29. Good police-community relations is really part of winning the battle against crime.
- _____ 30. There is a good possibility that a black person standing on a street corner late at night is a criminal.

- ___ 31. Name-calling by policemen adversely affects the citizen.
- ___ 32. The majority of the black community want more police protection in their neighborhoods.
- ___ 33. The majority of black people work hard.
- ___ 34. Having two separate police associations, one predominately for black officers and one predominately for white officers, is a good thing.
- ___ 35. Statements of police brutality and harassment are sometimes a consequence of misunderstanding or lack of information about the situation.

TABLE XXXIX

A COMPARISON OF FORMER WHITE C-CONTROLS WITH
 EIGHTEEN MONTHS EXPERIENCE WITH VETERAN
 WHITE OFFICERS ON TERMINAL VALUES

	C-Controls Means N=19	Veteran Means N=25	F ratios
A comfortable life	8.74	7.68	.43
An exciting life	7.37	9.76	2.10
A sense of accomplishment	6.95	5.28	1.61
A world at peace	9.79	7.96	1.32
A world of beauty	14.16	13.92	.04
Equality	12.84	12.24	.18
Family security	4.21	3.72	.27
Freedom	9.05	5.16	12.13
Happiness	7.53	6.72	.52
Inner harmony	9.16	10.20	.54
Mature love	9.00	9.12	.01
National security	10.74	11.08	.05
Pleasure	11.16	12.52	1.57
Salvation	13.79	13.68	.01
Self-respect	7.37	7.36	.00
Social recognition	12.74	13.84	.74
True friendship	9.79	11.60	1.93
Wisdom	6.63	9.16	3.30

significant at the .05 level

* significant at the .01 level

TABLE XL

A COMPARISON OF FORMER WHITE C-CONTROLS WITH EIGHTEEN MONTHS EXPERIENCE WITH VETERAN WHITE OFFICERS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

	C-Controls Means N=19	Veterans Means N=25	F ratios
Ambitious	8.10	7.24	.36
Broadminded	8.74	8.28	.09
Capable	8.37	6.64	1.24
Cheerful	12.79	10.80	1.59
Clean	9.00	11.04	1.94
Courageous	8.84	8.52	.06
Forgiving	12.95	12.12	.39
Helpful	8.58	11.44	4.18*
Honest	4.31	3.52	.47
Imaginative	12.31	13.00	.42
Independent	9.21	9.76	.10
Intellectual	9.00	13.20	8.66**
Logical	8.52	9.60	.68
Loving	10.47	12.20	1.48
Obedient	12.26	11.36	.32
Polite	12.26	10.88	.97
Responsible	5.58	4.92	.40
Self-controlled	9.84	6.48	5.28*

*significant at the .05 level

**significant at the .01 level

TABLE XL1

A COMPARISON OF FORMER WHITE C-CONTROLS WITH
EIGHTEEN MONTHS EXPERIENCE WITH VETERAN
WHITE OFFICERS ON OTHER ATTITUDE
MEASURES

	C-Controls Means N=19	Veterans Means N=25	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:			
F Scale	82.42	88.28	1.13
Ethnocentrism Negroes	26.84	26.16	.05
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	18.05	18.20	.01
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Ratings of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	8.31	8.00	.22
2. Ratings of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	4.74	5.12	.97
3. Ratings of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	7.16	6.12	.18
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	5.63	5.60	.01
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	4.42	4.64	.28
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	6.52	6.12	.82
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	8.84	9.52	1.30
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	3.89	4.60	1.74

TABLE XLI

A COMPARISON OF FORMER WHITE C-CONTROLS WITH
EIGHTEEN MONTHS EXPERIENCE WITH VETERAN
WHITE OFFICERS ON OTHER ATTITUDE
MEASURES

	C-Controls Means N=19	Veterans Means N=25	F ratios
Social Survey Questions:			
F Scale	82.42	88.28	1.13
Ethnocentrism Negroes	26.84	26.16	.05
Ethnocentrism Foreigners	18.05	18.20	.01
Attitude Questionnaire:			
1. Ratings of relations between blacks and police (items 1, 10, 11)	8.31	8.00	.22
2. Ratings of relations between whites and police (items 2, 12, 13)	4.74	5.12	.97
3. Ratings of relations between white and black police (items 3, 8, 9)	7.16	6.12	.18
4. Your feelings about blacks (items 4, 6)	5.63	5.60	.01
5. Your feelings about whites (items 5, 7)	4.42	4.64	.28
6. Black police get preferred treatment (item 14)	6.52	6.12	.82
7. White police get preferred treatment (item 15)	8.84	9.52	1.30
8. Are black police equal professionals (items 16, 19)	3.89	4.60	1.74

TABLE XLI (CONTINUED)

	C-Controls Means N=19	Veterans Means N=25	F ratios
9. Amount of black contact (17)	7.21	7.36	.04
10. Amount of white contact (18)	10.47	10.48	.00
11. Police want to understand blacks (20)	2.74	2.72	.00
12. Police guilty of abuse (21)	2.31	2.12	.41
13. Blacks laugh at police (22)	1.84	2.08	.55
14. Blacks are most criminal (23, 30)	5.95	6.80	1.93
15. Poverty and crime caused (24, 25)	4.74	5.12	.48
16. Community controlled police important (26)	4.32	4.12	.47
17. Separate police-community relations (27)	3.79	3.48	.84
18. Blacks assumed guilty (28)	2.32	3.00	3.78
19. Police-community relations important (29)	1.79	2.36	3.61
20. Name calling by police bad (31)	1.89	1.72	.56
21. Blacks want more police (32)	1.89	1.68	.46
22. Blacks work hard (33)	2.84	3.12	.48
23. Two separate police unions is best (34)	4.05	4.44	.93
24. Police brutality exaggerated (35)	1.79	1.60	.60

TABLE XLII

ANALYSIS OF PHAST II EXPERIENTIALS CONSIDERING
PHASE I STATUS ON TERMINAL VALUES

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
A comfortable life			
A - Former status	2	10.26	.41
B - Treatment	1	1.04	.04
A X B	2	13.23	.53
Error	93	24.85	
An exciting life			
A - Former status	2	3.62	.13
B - Treatment	1	22.27	.80
A X B	2	53.82	1.94
Error	93	27.72	
A sense of accomplishment			
A - Former status	2	16.00	.85
B - Treatment	1	5.33	.28
A X B	2	30.28	1.61
Error	93	18.82	
A world at peace			
A - Former status	2	26.61	.86
B - Treatment	1	1.61	.05
A X B	2	1.62	.05
Error	93	30.90	
A world of beauty			
A - Former status	2	4.77	.45
B - Treatment	1	2.57	.24
A X B	2	7.09	.66
Error	93	10.61	

TABLE XLII (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Equality			
A - Former status	2	16.26	.65
B - Treatment	1	8.76	.35
A X B	2	29.86	1.20
Error	93	24.96	
Freedom			
A - Former status	2	36.62	2.66
B - Treatment	1	11.15	.81
A X B	2	48.99	3.57*1
Error	93	13.74	
Happiness			
A - Former status	2	5.81	.30
B - Treatment	1	2.15	.11
A X B	2	33.70	1.77
Error	93	19.04	
Inner harmony			
A - Former status	2	4.13	.19
B - Treatment	1	.37	.02
A X B	2	1.45	.07
Error	93	21.27	
Mature love			
A - Former status	2	9.20	.47
B - Treatment	1	4.17	.21
A X B	2	.64	.03
Error	93	19.77	
National security			
A - Former status	2	3.24	.12
B - Treatment	1	34.77	1.29
A X B	2	.69	.02
Error	93	27.04	

TABLE XLII (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Pleasure			
A - Former status	2	1.14	.08
B - Treatment	1	5.96	.44
A X B	2	21.80	1.62
Error	93	13.44	
Salvation			
A - Former status	2	.19	.01
B - Treatment	1	19.29	.70
A X B	2	4.01	.15
Error	93	27.40	
Self-respect			
A - Former status	2	25.25	1.46
B - Treatment	1	.85	.05
A X B	2	25.47	1.47
Error	93	17.28	
Social recognition			
A - Former status	2	6.05	.27
B - Treatment	1	2.30	.11
A X B	2	29.16	1.35
Error	93	21.66	
True friendship			
A - Former status	2	41.98	2.58
B - Treatment	1	17.44	1.07
A X B	2	1.60	.09
Error	93	16.27	
Wisdom			
A - Former status	2	3.52	.21
B - Treatment	1	9.88	.59
A X B	2	2.19	.13
Error	93	16.66	

*significant at the .05 level.

¹Analysis of the means reveals that this significant interaction is due entirely to C-controls who received no group training during Phase 2. They rated "freedom" significantly less important than either C-controls with group experience or any other sub-group, whether treated or non-treated.

TABLE XLIII

ANALYSIS OF PHASE 2 EXPERIMENTALS CONSIDERING
PHASE I STATUS ON INSTRUMENTAL VALUES

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Ambitious			
A -- Former status	2	36.10	2.09
B -- Treatment	1	.12	.01
A X B	2	35.97	2.08
Error		17.28	
Broadminded			
A -- Former status	2	7.79	.35
B -- Treatment	1	1.27	.05
A X B	2	38.96	1.77
Error		21.95	
Capable			
A -- Former status	2	58.56	2.52
B -- Treatment	1	28.29	1.22
A X B	2	39.28	1.69
Error		23.24	
Cheerful			
A -- Former status	2	1.81	.10
B -- Treatment	1	14.43	.82
A X B	2	62.61	3.56*1
Error	93	17.58	
Clean			
A -- Former status	2	5.23	.22
B -- Treatment	1	2.85	.12
A X B	2	25.25	1.06
Error	93	23.85	
Courageous			
A -- Former status	2	23.55	1.00
B -- Treatment	1	9.32	.40

TABLE XLIII (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F Ratios
A X B	2	2.60	.11
Error	93	23.49	
Forgiving			
A - Former status	2	8.96	.46
B - Treatment	1	.76	.03
A X B	2	5.69	.29
Error	93	19.38	
Helpful			
A - Former status	2	27.82	1.25
B - Treatment	1	4.99	.22
A X B	2	37.11	1.68
Error	93	22.13	
Honest			
A - Former status	2	38.14	2.36
B - Treatment	1	6.74	.42
A X B	2	44.41	2.75
Error	93	16.13	
Imaginative			
A - Former status	2	.22	.01
B - Treatment	1	21.22	1.12
A X B	2	25.64	1.35
Error	93	18.99	
Independent			
A - Former status	2	21.66	.84
B - Treatment	1	.75	.03
A X B	2	3.38	.13
Error	93	25.78	
Intellectual			
A - Former status	2	13.99	.57
B - Treatment	1	42.34	1.73
A X B	2	7.86	.32
Error	93	24.41	

TABLE XLIII (CONTINUED)

Logical	df	MS	F ratios
A - Former status	2	39.03	2.19
B - Treatment	1	.72	.04
A X B	2	31.31	1.75
Error	93	17.84	
Loving			
A - Former status	2	11.81	.49
B - Treatment	1	2.86	.12
A X B	2	3.19	.13
Error	93	23.97	
Obedient			
A - Former status	2	6.07	.31
B - Treatment	1	.01	.00
A X B	2	12.48	.64
Error	93	19.36	
Polite			
A - Former status	2	28.04	1.49
B - Treatment	1	6.44	.34
A X B	2	.80	.04
Error	93	18.87	
Responsible			
A - Former status	2	23.38	1.22
B - Treatment	1	13.70	.72
A X B	2	3.87	.20
Error	93	19.11	
Self-controlled			
A - Former status	2	54.48	2.53
B - Treatment	1	17.48	.81
A X B	2	24.27	1.13
Error	93	21.54	

*significant at the .05 level

†Untreated former experimentals and treated former C-control both rated "cheerful" as less important than their counterparts in Phase 2. Treated and untreated former controls were identical. There appears to be little logical consistency in this finding.

ANALYSIS OF PHASE 2 EXPERIMENTALS CONSIDERING
PHASE 1 STATUS ON OTHER ATTITUDE MEASURES

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
F Scale			
A - Former status	2	144.23	.48
B - Treatment	1	4.08	.01
A X B	2	672.59	2.22
Error	93	302.71	

E Scale (Negro)

A - Former status	2	62.77	.61
B - Treatment	1	130.67	1.28
A X B	2	111.43	1.09
Error	93	101.81	

E Scale (Foreigner)

A - Former status	2	98.60	3.01
B - Treatment	1	19.42	.59
A X B	2	3.43	.10
Error	93	32.77	

Relationships between blacks and police

A - Former status	2	3.85	.81
B - Treatment	1	5.39	1.13
A X B	2	6.90	1.45
Error	93	4.76	

Relationships between whites and police

A - Former status	2	1.86	.89
B - Treatment	1	.26	.12
A X B	2	1.21	.58
Error	93	2.07	

Relationships between black and white police

TABLE XLIV (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
A - Former status	2	3.72	.77
B - Treatment	1	15.68	3.22
A X B	2	3.57	.73
Error	93	4.87	
Your feelings about blacks			
A - Former status	2	.62	.27
B - Treatment	1	15.29	6.66*
A X B	2	7.82	.34
Error	93	2.29	
Your feelings about whites			
A - Former status	2	.34	.20
B - Treatment	1	.39	.23
A X B	2	4.35	2.58
Error	93	1.68	
Preferential treatment of blacks in department			
A - Former status	2	.75	.37
B - Treatment	1	1.09	.54
A X B	2	3.53	1.74
Error	93	2.02	
Preferential treatment of whites in department			
A - Former status	2	3.29	1.19
B - Treatment	1	1.14	.41
A X B	2	4.40	1.60
Error	93	2.75	
Your feelings about black officers			
A - Former status	2	4.30	1.31
B - Treatment	1	.16	.05
A X B	2	2.33	.71
Error	93	3.27	

TABLE XLIV (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Amount of contact with blacks			
A - Former status	2	1.18	.19
B - Treatment	1	7.45	1.20
A X B	2	5.02	.81
Error	93	6.19	
Amount of contact with whites			
A - Former status	2	.83	.09
B - Treatment	1	9.33	1.04
A X B	2	17.50	1.97
Error	93	8.90	
Police desire greater understanding of blacks			
A - Former status	2	.41	.33
B - Treatment	1	1.53	1.23
A X B	2	.11	.08
Error	93	1.25	
Some police guilty of physical-verbal abuse			
A - Former status	2	.45	.40
B - Treatment	1	.38	.34
A X B	2	.57	.50
Error	93	1.13	
Blacks encourage other blacks to ridicule police			
A - Former status	2	.74	1.13
B - Treatment	1	.03	.05
A X B	2	3.90	5.98**1
Error	93	.65	
Blacks more likely to be criminal			
A - Former status	2	.35	.08
B - Treatment	1	.28	.07
A X B	2	5.83	1.41
Error	93	4.14	

TABLE XLIV (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Environmental causation important in crime			
A - Former status	2	11.60	3.39*
B - Treatment	1	.05	.01
A X B	2	7.56	2.21
Error	93	3.42	
Black community controlled police department important			
A - Former status	2	.06	.04
B - Treatment	1	.68	.52
A X B	2	.61	.46
Error	93	1.32	
Police-community relations unit should be separate from department			
A - Former status	2	.54	.39
B - Treatment	1	4.51	3.30
A X B	2	.14	.09
Error	93	1.37	
Blacks often assumed guilty of crimes			
A - Former status	2	.13	.09
B - Treatment	1	.94	.66
A X B	2	3.63	2.56
Error	93	1.42	
Police-community relations important			
A - Former status	2	2.53	2.25
B - Treatment	1	.08	.07
A X B	2	4.19	3.74*2
Error	93	1.12	
Name calling by police is bad			
A - Former status	2	1.46	1.55
B - Treatment	1	.15	.16
A X B	2	.68	.72
Error	93	.95	

TABLE XLIV (CONTINUED)

	<i>df</i>	MS	F ratios
Blacks want more police protection			
A - Former status	2	2.66	1.90
B - Treatment	1	.19	.14
A X B	2	1.10	.79
Error	93	1.40	
Majority of blacks work hard			
A - Former status	2	.64	.44
B - Treatment	1	.38	.26
A X B	2	2.86	1.98
Error	93	1.44	
Two separate police associations for blacks and whites			
A - Former status	2	.05	.04
B - Treatment	1	1.29	1.14
A X B	2	1.45	1.29
Error	93	1.12	
Statements of police brutality exaggerated			
A - Former status	2	.13	.19
B - Treatment	1	.80	1.15
A X B	2	2.01	2.88
Error	93	.69	

*significant at the .05 level.

**significant at the .01 level.

¹ Former experimentals seen in groups during Phase 2 disagree, more than their controls, that blacks encourage other blacks to ridicule police. The converse is true for former controls and C-controls with present experimentals agreeing more than their controls with this proposition.

² Former experimentals seen in groups during Phase 2 disagree, more than their controls that police-community relations are important. Results for other subgroups are in the opposite direction. None of these findings appear to have a consistently logical direction.